Published quarterly on the 15th of the month

Vol. XXXVIII, No. 4 December 1948

The Church Divinity School of the Pacific
2451 RIDGE ROAD, BERKELEY, CALIF.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

EDITOR: H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:	
'The Bishops' Blunder'	329
Communism and Christianity	331
Lambeth and the Priesthood of Women	334
A Martyr of the Miraculous	336
Lambeth and Reunion	339
The Editor	
Memories of Rural Church Life	356
Canon Earle, B.D.	
New Faith in Freedom	360
Raymond C. Knox	
Prayer in the Religion of Jesus	364
Henry Mick, M.A., S.T.D.	
The Liberal Jew and the Liberal Christian	370
The Editor	
Book Reviews	373
Correspondence	

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 3/- net. Annual Subscription, 11s.

AMERICAN AGENT:
MRS. CHARLES E. COCKEY, 1423 Linden Avenue, Baltimore, Md., U.S.A.

Entered as Second Class Matter, July 18, 1931, at the Post Office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879 (Sec. 397, P.L. & R.).

THE HIBBERT JOURNAL

A Quarterly Review of Religion, Theology and Philosophy

Edited by **G. STEPHENS SPINKS**

Contents for January, 1949

PSYCHICAL RESEARCH AND HUMAN PERSONALITY	Professor H. H. Price
LAMBETH FROM HIGHGATE CEMETERY	The Editor
THE PERSONALITY OF THOMAS HOBBES	Professor H. L. Stewart
THE WEST IN SEARCH OF A METAPHYSIC	Dr. F. H. Heinemann
EXISTENTIALISM AND HUMANISM	Rev. J. M. Thompson
THE LOGIC OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM	Rev. Dr. S. G. F. Brandon
GREEK GIFTS	Sir Richard Tute
INTUITION: ITS NATURE AND FUNCTION	Leslie Belton
BUSINESS IN GREAT WATERS	Lt.-Cmdr. R. C. Holmes
THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON THE WESTERN VIEW OF LIFE	K. G. Collier

Subscription 12s. 6d. net per annum, post free

Single copies 3s. 6d. post free

A free specimen copy of a back number will be sent on request

GEORGE ALLEN AND UNWIN LIMITED

40 MUSEUM ST., LONDON, W.C.1

Henry VIII and The Reformation

Dr. H. MAYNARD SMITH

In this comprehensive volume, the author of *Pre-Reformation England* examines all the social, political, literary and cultural aspects of one of the greatest movements in England's history. 30s. net

Does God Exist?

Prof. A. E. TAYLOR

The author wrote this book to satisfy himself during the gloomy days of war and it is published in the hope that meditations which he found useful to himself may prove beneficial to others also. 3rd Impression. 7s. 6d. net

Forgiveness and Reconciliation

Rev. Dr. VINCENT TAYLOR

In this volume Dr. Taylor has examined the New Testament teaching concerning forgiveness, justification, reconciliation, fellowship and sanctification. In a final chapter he treats the relation of the Christian experience as a whole as well as aspects of the Atonement and Divine Love. 2nd Impression. 2nd Edition.
12s. 6d. net

MACMILLAN & CO. LTD.

THE
MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 4 DECEMBER Vol. XXXVIII

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Bishops' Blunder'

The *Church Times* of November 19th, in a leading article entitled 'The Bishops' Blunder' criticizes severely the action of the bishops in producing and publishing *The Shorter Prayer Book according to the use of the Church of England.* This book, as stated in its Preface by the Archbishop of Canterbury, aims at providing

> 'for congregational use an edition of the Book of Common Prayer, limited to the parts most often required, simplified in arrangement, and generally made easier to follow. The Orders of Service and the wording of prayers and psalms are unchanged, except for some of the variations in the Deposited Book of 1928. Rubrics have been re-worded for the sake of simplicity. . . .'

The book itself, a most attractive little volume, strongly bound, clearly arranged, beautifully printed by the privileged presses, is priced at 3/6.

A group of bishops, authorized by the two Primates and under their general supervision, produced the volume. There is not the slightest doubt that this book, especially in this era of limited paper supply and costly production, has met a real need. Moreover, its skilful selection from our Church services and their simplified arrangement also meets a very real need. We are sure that a growing number of Church people will appreciate the substitution of the revised Occasional Offices of 1928 for those of 1662. The bishops deserve our gratitude for their achievement.

This, however, is far from being the verdict of the *Church Times* and its clerical adherents in the Church Assembly. Addressing the Church Assembly on November 11th, Dean Selwyn, having described the shortened book as an 'anonymous and mysterious production' which with its 'extra little pieces of chaos' had left the Church in complete confusion, demanded the

adoption of practical measures for the cessation of its publication. In the heated debate which followed, some of the clergy attacked the bishops for their unconstitutional action and in other cases attacked the defects in the book itself.

In the final decision the bishops voted solidly for the book: a small majority of the laity also supported it, but the majority of the clergy voted against it.

Considering the limitations with which the compilers were faced their work has been done extremely well. The attacks on the book's defects were feeble, but the accusation that the bishops acted unconstitutionally is more serious. Their soundest defence is that liturgical necessity demanded action, and action which they alone could take effectively and swiftly. *Necessitas non habet leges.* Their action exhibited courageous initiative and practical ability.

If the question be pressed, 'Had the bishops the legal right to authorize the *Shorter Prayer Book*?' the answer is 'No.' The Deposited Book of 1928 has no legal authority, and so the bishops have no legal right to authorize its services for use in public worship in the Church of England. On the other hand, it is only just to observe that the bishops have not claimed any legal authority for the *Shorter Prayer Book* which contains portions of the Deposited Book. The *Shorter Prayer Book* has only been authorized for *optional* use.

Our bishops to-day are the victims of the sins of their episcopal predecessors, who illegally authorized the use of the Deposited Book in 1928. All that the bishops of to-day have done is to increase the value of their *Shorter Prayer Book* by including in it extracts from the Deposited Book which were not condemned in Parliament when the Book itself was rejected. This does not legalize what they have done, if it be illegal, but it does provide strong moral justification.

Perhaps the best description of the *Shorter Prayer Book* is that it is a liturgical experiment. It is to be hoped that the bishops will continue to make these experiments with the aim of ministering to our nation's spiritual needs and ultimately achieving a revised Book of Common Prayer which, by receiving the whole-hearted support of the vast majority of Church people, will inevitably secure legal authority from the Crown.

There is another aspect of the case which demands examination. Dom Gregory Dix charged the bishops with *unconstitutional action* because they had not sought the co-operation of the clergy and laity of the Church Assembly. This is strange coming from a champion of Catholic order. St. Ignatius wrote: 'Let nothing

be done without your bishop.' He did not write: 'Your bishop can do nothing without you.' In the primitive Church the government may have been congregational or presbyterian or episcopal, but the Church of England is governed by the Episcopate under the Crown. The English Episcopate can alone take the initiative in the reformulation of doctrine and the reformation of public worship, and only what they approve can be authorized by the Crown. In the Church Assembly the clergy and laity may consult, counsel, criticize, but they cannot control the bishops constitutionally.

This does not mean, however, that the bishops themselves have absolute authority in the sphere of doctrine and worship. They are required by their episcopal vows to act in accordance with the constitution of the Church of England. Hence all alterations in doctrine and worship initiated and approved by the bishops can only have legal authority for the clergy and laity if sanctioned by the Crown speaking through Parliament. It is against this constitutional authority of the bishops and the Crown that the *Church Times* and its adherents are in revolt.

It is grotesque that such unconstitutionalists should charge our English Episcopate with unconstitutional action. *Quis tulerit Gracchos de seditione querentes?* 'Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi.'

Communism and Christianity

The editorial comment of *The Times* on Archbishop Garbett's sermon[1] delivered on November 10th to the Industrial Christian Fellowship called forth a spirited reply from our honest and unflinching Communist M.P., Mr. Gallacher. In his letter to *The Times* of November 17th, Mr. Gallacher defined Communism as follows:

> 'Communism is a theory of society based on the proposition that the land and the means of wealth production should be the common property of the people and the foundation on which social relations should be established.'

And asked:

> 'Where is there a Christian, a Jew, a Mohamedan, or a Buddhist who can take exception on moral grounds to that?'

It is not Communism as here defined by Mr. Gallacher which was condemned by the Archbishop of York in his sermon. There is nothing definitely anti-Christian in Mr. Gallacher's Communism, neither is there anything definitely Christian in it, although Mr.

[1] Published by the Industrial Christian Fellowship (1 Broadway, Westminster, S.W.1, 1948; 6d.).

Gallacher seems to argue that there is. The Communism of the primitive Christian Church in Jerusalem, to which Mr. Gallacher appeals to enforce his argument, was inspired by *Christian love*, which prompted the richer members of the community to give up their property *voluntarily* for the benefit of the poorer members of that Church. The experiment proved to be an economic failure, and the poverty of the Church of Jerusalem became so great that its 'poor saints' stood in urgent need of contributions from the Pauline Churches, which apparently had not followed the Jerusalem economic example.

There are many kinds of Communism, as every student of economics knows. Of Mr. Gallacher's type of Communism Dr. Garbett writes:

> 'That it is impractical, that economically it would lead to ruin, that politically it is unworkable; but the ideal is not un-Christian, and ought not to be condemned as such.' (p. 2.)

It is, of course, Marxian Communism that Dr. Garbett condemned in his sermon. Of this he said:

> 'But while it is possible to be a Christian and a Communist, it is not possible to be a Christian and a Marxian Communist without disloyalty either to Christ or to Marx, for Marxian Communism is far more than a political or economic theory; it has a doctrine behind it which leaves no room for Christianity or for any form of theism. It teaches that the world is material; that the material world is the only reality; that the mind is only the product of matter. In accordance with this, Marx taught that human progress has been due, not to the conflict of ideas which led to a further apprehension of truth, but to the clash between economic forces due to class warfare which will eventually lead to a higher economic and social order through the destruction of capitalism and the bourgeois, as in the past it resulted in the destruction of feudalism. This "dialectical materialism," to use a most cumbrous phrase, describes progress as due to an incessant economic warfare which, governed by iron laws, is remorseless and inevitable in its results. Such a deterministic and materialistic philosophy is openly and avowedly atheistic. Lenin made this plain when he wrote:
>
> '"The saying of Marx, 'Religion is the opium for the people,' is the corner-stone of the Marxist point of view on the matter of religion. All contemporary religion and churches, all and every kind of religious organization, Marxism has always viewed as organs of bourgeois reaction, serving as a defence of exploitation and drugging of the working class."' p. 4.)

Hence the Archbishop concludes that:

> 'There can be no common ground between Marxian and Christian doctrine and ethics; they are fundamentally opposed. And the methods of violence, deceit and cruelty used by Communism to gain its ends are the cause of incalculable misery and fear throughout the world. There can be no agreement between militant Communism and a Church which has peace and goodwill as its aim. The relationship between Christianity and Communism is summed up in the resolution of the Lambeth Conference, which declares

> ' "That Marxian Communism is contrary to Christian faith and practice, for it denies the existence of God, Revelation and a future life: it treats the individual man as a means and not an end: it encourages class warfare: it regards the moral law not as absolute but as relative to the needs of the State." ' (p. 9.)

In the body of his address Dr. Garbett more explicitly defined the differences between Christianity and Marxian Communism as threefold:

> ' 1. Christianity believes in a personal God, all powerful, of perfect holiness, goodness and love. . . .
>
> ' 2. The Christian who has faith in a righteous God believes in a moral law, binding at all times and in all places. . . .
>
> ' 3. From the denial of God there follows the denial of the dignity and rights of man. . . . He has no individuality of his own; he must act, speak and think as the State directs. He is a means to an end. The Christian looks on man as the child of God, the Marxian as a tool for the use of the State. . . . (p. 6.)

William Temple summed up these differences in a sentence:

> 'The great and profound difference between Christian civilization and the kind of civilization which the Communists are aiming at lies in our affirmation that the primary fact of the world is God, that each individual man is the child of God, that at the root of his being he is a child of God, and that he is a child of God before he is a citizen of any national community.'

It seems to us that there are five things which we Christians need to be constantly conscious of to-day in this anti-Communist conflict and controversy.

1. That many professing Marxist Communists, especially in this land of the free, are much better than their Marxian creed. We are sure they would never tolerate in this country the abominations perpetrated behind the Iron Curtain. This, of course, is true of Mr. Gallacher.

2. That the practice of social and economic amelioration in accordance with the ideals of Christian love, freedom and truth, demanding much personal courage, wisdom and even self-sacrifice, is the only effective way of preventing the triumph of Marxian Communism in this country.

3. That there are certain social ideals which, although not specifically Christian, conduce to social welfare:

(*a*) The recognition that the abolition of private property by a State becomes an important factor in the enslavement of its citizens and leads inevitably to various forms of tyranny.

(*b*) That all policies of social amelioration should aim at levelling up, and that levelling up is far harder, slower and less popular than levelling down.

(*c*) That the interests of the individual and his community are best served by providing for all 'a career open to talents.'

This policy encourages initiative, energy, enterprise, originality, independence, and the development of those qualities of leadership which is one of the great factors in social evolution.

4. That there is a great deal of shortsighted, muddle-headed, so-called Christian Socialism, which can be the greatest enemy to sound social reform and a very powerful, although unconscious, friend to Marxian Communism. One way in which it does this is to create a sense of frustration, aimlessness, discontent in the breasts of many young people, which effectively checks response to the ideals of duty, hard work, thrift and self-discipline. This state of mind renders youth the victim of sloth and debilitating recreations in which the gambling spirit plays a conspicuous part and lays the foundations of materialism, determinism and pessimism, which constitutes the seed plot in which Marxian seed readily germinates.

5. It is not fulminations against Marxian Communism but the eradication of its root causes with which the Church must deal, and that can best be done, not by the Church engaging in party politics or in spectacular demonstrations, but by the slow and difficult process of sound education which unites the ideal and practice of Christian stewardship with modern scientific methods in economics, industry and commerce.

Lambeth and the Priesthood of Women

In this year of grace 1948, two eminent clergymen of the Church of England admitted two eminent women members of the Anglican Communion to the highest degrees which our two ancient universities are able to confer. The recipients of the degrees were H.M. Queen Elizabeth and Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt. The two clergymen officiating were Dr. Raven, Vice-Chancellor of Cambridge University, and the very Rev. Dr. Lowe, Vice-Chancellor of Oxford University.

To the founders of our mediaeval universities the action of these two priests would not only appear extraordinary but repugnant. Abelard and Héloise might have applauded such university action, but no one else among their contemporaries — certainly not St. Bernard.

To-day, however, the authorities of our ancient universities applaud the conferring of their degrees on distinguished women. Why? Because in the course of the ages ideas of the right of women to higher education and to the privileges it confers have radically changed in our Western civilization. This change has not come about quickly because academic bodies are extraordinarily

conservative where institutions and customs are concerned, but such has been the advance of educated public opinion in our Western civilization that even these ancient academic bodies have yielded to it. In the legal and medical professions, in political and municipal government, a similar change has taken place. In the Latin Church and in the Church of England, 'the least reformed of the Reformed Churches,' there has been no change in the status of women.

It may be asked: What about the institution of Deaconesses in the Church of England? Deaconesses are no new creation in the Christian Church but the revival of a very ancient order. Its ancestors are Phoebe the Deaconess of Cenchreae, the Saronic port of Corinth (*Rom.* xvi, 1), and those two heroic women, tortured by the younger Pliny, to whom he refers in his letter to Trajan.

For some years past there has been a movement in the Anglican Communion to secure the admission of women to the priesthood. High hopes were entertained that the Lambeth Conference of 1948 would approve this proposal — at least experimentally. These hopes have been dashed to the ground. The Lambeth Committee appointed to consider the Chinese Canon proposing the admission of deaconesses to the priesthood for an experimental period of twenty years has been decisively rejected. The Lambeth Conference itself, dealing with the decision of this Committee, not only agreed with the negative decision of the Committee but added 'that the time has not come for its further formal consideration.' Two reasons were given for its decision:

> 'Such an experiment would be against Anglican tradition and order and would gravely affect the internal and external relations of the Anglican Communion.'

Of course, had Lambeth approved the experiment there would have been an indignant protest by a powerful Anglo-Catholic section of the Conference, not simply on the ground that admission of women to the priesthood is contrary to ecclesiastical precedent, but also that such action by the Anglican Communion would seriously hinder the future admission of that Communion into the Papal Obedience.

It is this double motive which prompts Anglo-Catholicism to oppose, not only the adaptation of traditional Church dogmas and institutions to modern needs, but also reunion with the Reformed Churches on equal terms.

How long is the Anglican Communion going to tolerate this dictatorship by a minority which is not fundamentally loyal to the

genius of the Church of England? No one has better defined that genius than has Edmund Burke:

> 'As an independent Church, professing fallibility, the Church of England has claimed the right of acting without the consent of any other; as a Church she claims, and has always exercised, a right of reforming whatever appeared amiss in her doctrine, her discipline, or her rites.'

A Martyr of the Miraculous

Under the heading 'Oxford Modernism, 1910-1914' the *Guardian* of November 12th, 1948, republishes an article from the *Oxford Magazine* of October 28th, 1948, contributed by the Rev. J. M. Thompson, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford.

In his article Mr. Thompson deals with the existence and activities of a society consisting of Oxford dons, clerical and lay, interested in the discussion of modern religious problems. The minute book of the meetings of the society, comprising two circles, inner and outer, has a special interest for students of the evolution of Modernism in the Church of England since it ultimately produced *Foundations* under the leadership of B. H. Streeter.

A number of distinguished men were members of this society, most of whom are dead, some of whom survive as diocesan bishops, and one of whom became the martyr of the movement. It is he, the Rev. J. M. Thompson, though he would disclaim the title martyr, who has now deposited the society's minute book in the Bodleian.

The Modern Churchman of August, 1911, contains two editorial articles (pp. 237-50) entitled (1) 'The Case of the Rev. J. M. Thompson'; (2) 'Miracles.' At this time Mr. Thompson, nephew of the saintly Francis Paget, then Bishop of Oxford, was Dean of Divinity of Magdalen College. Mr. Thompson, whom we now know as a historian of the French Revolution, was in 1911 an acute and fearless critic of the Gospels and published three books, *Jesus according to St. Mark* (1910), *Miracles in the New Testament* (1911) and *Through Facts to Faith* (1913), recording his critical conclusions and their bearing upon our traditional theology. It was the second of these volumes which created an ecclesiastical storm, for in it Mr. Thompson had denied that God uses miraculous methods in order to make known His Will to mankind and that the Virgin Birth and the Physical Resurrection of our Lord are historical events.

It must not be concluded, however, that Mr. Thompson, in denying the miraculous, denied the Incarnation; on the contrary,

he explicitly affirmed his belief in the Incarnation, but it was of course, a non-miraculous Incarnation. He wrote :

> 'Though no miracles accompanied His (Christ's) entry into, or presence in, or departure from the world; though He did not think or speak or act otherwise than as a man; though He yields nothing to historical analysis but human elements; yet in Jesus Christ God is incarnate — discovered and worshipped, as God alone can be, by the insight of faith.' (p. 217.)
>
> 'The truth of the Incarnation is not that God and man, two incompatible units, somehow came together; but that it was always part of God's nature that He should be made man, and that man was always incomplete until Christ came. The Incarnation is the inevitable meeting of two natures meant for intercommunion. . . . It is, therefore, idle to think that by shutting our eyes to the divine in Christ we shall find the human, or that by looking away from the human in Him we shall see the divine.' (p. 213.)
>
> 'The belief in miracles has hitherto been the chief bar to the thorough acceptance of this position. So long as it was thought that Jesus' divinity, which was generally veiled in His humanity, sometimes broke through in acts that were obviously superhuman, it was inevitable that these acts should be taken to be more divine than the rest of His self-revelation. The unmediated Godhead was preferred to the mediated. It was easier to appreciate: it was a plainer object of hope and fear. Yet the complete mediation of God by man is the essence of the Christian Incarnation. And it is only by the rejection of miracles that this doctrine can come to its full rights.' (p. 213.)

Mr. Thompson's responsible and judicious combination of positive religious affirmation with his critical denials was, however, unable to avert the storm which burst in ecclesiastical circles. He was attacked in the ecclesiastical press and the Archbishop of Canterbury and other prelates were petitioned to take action.

The Modern Churchman deplored the attacks and counselled a policy of unprejudiced and open-minded reconsideration. We wrote :

> 'The Modern Churchman feels neither embarrassment nor indignation at the Rev. J. M. Thompson's conclusions. . . . He does not think that the authority of the Christian Religion is based on the miraculous. He believes that its authority is rational, moral, and spiritual: he believes that its strength lies in the appeal which our Lord's Personality and teaching are capable of making to man's reason, conscience, and spiritual perception.' (p. 246.)
>
> 'If as Christian teachers we persist in this age in basing Christ's Sonship upon the miraculous, we are probably acting in such a way as to discredit Christ's claims in the eyes of the modern man, by making His moral and spiritual majesty a secondary consideration.' (p. 250.)
>
> 'Much as we may deplore the form which the agitation seems to be taking, yet we do not deplore the agitation itself. In any case agitation is better than stagnation, especially if agitation be followed by investigation. The subject of the miraculous, particularly in its relation to the doctrine of the Incarnation, needs to be seriously investigated by Churchmen.' (p. 237.)

Our pleas proved unavailing. The Bishop of Winchester withdrew his licence from Mr. Thompson, and in 1915, while retaining his college fellowship, Mr. Thompson resigned his position of Dean of Divinity. And there the J. M. Thompson case ended for Mr. Thompson, but not for the Church of England. In our article on his case we wrote:

> 'It would be a very facile and, as we believe, a fatal method of treating the case, for the Bishops to say without further investigation, "We decide, guided by ecclesiastical tradition and the statements of various authoritative documents, that the life of Christ was miraculous. This has ever been the view of the Church, he therefore who ventures to assert the contrary is a heretic and must be silenced and deprived."
>
> 'The educated Englishman demands more than this from the Episcopate. The question for him is not whether the Rev. J. M. Thompson is teaching something which is contrary to immemorial Church tradition—presumably he is, or there would not be all this agitation—but whether he is teaching something which is contrary to truth. If he is teaching in accordance with the truth, it really is not of supreme importance whether he is teaching contrary to Church tradition. No doubt it is a pity that Church tradition is not in complete harmony with truth, but that can be remedied in time, especially if, as a nation, we steadily encourage truth seekers and truth teachers in our National Church. Moreover, the Rev. J. M. Thompson if he be teaching the truth cannot be anything else but a loyal Churchman and a good Christian in the widest sense of those terms.
>
> 'Jesus Christ the Head of the Church is the Truth, His Kingdom is the Kingdom of the Truth, everyone that is of the truth heareth His voice, therefore if the Rev. J. M. Thompson is teaching the truth, the Church has no moral right to silence him. Therefore it is necessary that the truth of the Rev. J. M. Thompson's conclusions should be investigated very thoroughly before sentence be passed. As the Dean of Canterbury recently pointed out, the view of the Old Testament which had prevailed in Christendom from the time of Christ had completely changed within the last fifty years. Is it not possible, then, that a similar change may within the next few years take place in Church of England circles with regard to the miraculous? Therefore let not the Church be hasty to condemn Mr. Thompson simply because his doctrine differs in this matter from ecclesiastical tradition.' (p. 239f.)

This was in 1911, when Dr. Rashdall said: 'Disbelief in miracles is the only heresy for the Church of England to-day.' Have things changed much for the better in 1948?

LAMBETH AND REUNION

By The Editor

'Since Christ's cause in the world can never be fully served by a divided Church, we also lay upon you the duty to take every opportunity of co-operating with Christians of other Churches, and to work and pray for the Reunion of Christendom.'

IN these words in their Encyclical Letter, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the 329 Anglican bishops assembled at Lambeth address the faithful, clerical and lay, at home and beyond the seas. This Encyclical Letter is supplemented by the *Lambeth Conference* 1948 *Report* consisting of 120 pages, ten of which are devoted to 'The Unity of the Church.'

In this section we have a record of relations existing between the Anglican Communion and other Christian Churches. This section summarizes the results so far achieved, and the negotiations pending, which have as their objective 'the organic unity' of Christendom. References to the Roman Catholic Church are conspicuous by their absence. The impression derived from the study of these Lambeth documents, where they deal with Christian Reunion, is that there is something radically wrong with the method being pursued. After expressing in inspiring phrases the uplifting ideal of a comprehensive, many-sided, universal Christian Church, enriched by the heritage of the past, 'loyal to all truth, and gathering into its fellowship "all who profess and call themselves Christians,"' the *Report* proceeds to prescribe the method by which this ideal is to be realized. The terms of this method are taken *verbatim* from the 'relevant resolutions of the Lambeth Conference of 1920,' which are enunciated as follows:

(*a*) The theological issues, especially those concerning the Church and the ministry, should be faced at the outset, and to this end the negotiating Churches should obtain the help of theologians in framing schemes for reunion or inter-communion.

(*b*) The unification of the ministry in a form satisfactory to all the bodies concerned, either at the inauguration of the union or as soon as possible thereafter, is likely to be a prerequisite to success in all future proposals for the reunion of the Churches.

(*c*) The integral connexion between the Church and the ministry should be safeguarded in all proposals for the achievement of intercommunion through the creation of a mutually recognized ministry.

(*d*) The goal in any steps towards a united Church within a given area should always be a Church with which the Anglican Churches could eventually be in full communion.

> (*e*) Because the Anglican Communion is itself a treasured unity with a special vocation, a part of our Communion contemplating a step which would involve its withdrawal from the Anglican family of Churches should consult the Lambeth Conference or the Provinces and member Churches of this family of Churches before final commitment to such a Course. (p. 40, Part i.)

The spirit of the Lambeth Conference of 1920 (professedly inherited by the Lambeth Conference of 1948) dealt with Christian reunion in a most inspiring and promising manner, but how miserably meagre have been the results achieved in the subsequent twenty-eight years! Why is this? It is due, we believe, to the vital ideal of the 1920 Lambeth Conference having been strangled by the method that the Conference prescribed for the realization of its ideal and by the ways in which that method has been implemented by the ecclesiastical authorities. That method is not only elaborately unpractical, but also provides ample opportunity for the opponents of reunion schemes to thwart them; but, worse than that, *the method begins at the wrong end.* It begins with present-day differences between the existing sectarian Churches in the sphere of theological doctrine and ecclesiastical organization. These differences the Lambeth authorities direct '*should be faced at the outset.*'

We are convinced that the right method ought to be the reverse. It ought to begin at the other end. It ought to by-pass all the theological and ecclesiastical differences and to go straight back to the Jesus of history and to His Gospel of the Kingdom of God as made known to us by the modern study of the Gospels.

Sceptical Gospel critics will reply: the method you propose is quite out of date. Historical criticism of the Gospels demonstrates that the Jesus of history is 'unknown.' The New Testament records of the activities and teaching of Jesus are a hopeless mixture full of inconsistencies, the product for the most part of Church traditions intended for propagandist and liturgical use, and they are much later in date than the events of the period which they profess to record.

We would reply that the preposterous pretensions of this sceptical criticism are steadily losing ground at the present time, and the Source Criticism of, for instance, Burkitt, Streeter, C. H. Dodd and T. W. Manson on the one hand, and the Form Criticism of such judicious scholars as Easton, Vincent Taylor and Glasson on the other hand, provide a sound foundation of assured knowledge for the understanding of the personality and Gospel of Jesus.

If, then, making use of the critical methods and 'assured results' of this balanced scholarship, we study Jesus and His

Mission and Message as enshrined in our earliest Gospel sources we secure the striking portrait of a religious genius — the creative source of the Christian Religion, who claimed to possess a unique knowledge of the Divine Being and of His Will for mankind. Here is to be found the true source of Christian unity, and those who are striving for the reunion of Christendom ought to begin their task by going back to that source.

Jesus is the Good Shepherd and His Sheep hear His voice; 'He calleth them by name,' and they follow Him, and thus they become one flock under one shepherd. (The Eastern shepherd does not drive his sheep: he leads them.) It is by the obedience of each sheep to the shepherd that the unity of the flock is secured. It is in this relationship of a person to a person, not in the relationship of a person to any organization, that Christian unity is primarily secured.

Bishop Westcott pointed out years ago the disastrous misunderstanding which the mistranslation one *fold* for one *flock* (*Jn.* x, 16, A.V. derived from the *Vulgate*) had brought about in the history of Western Christendom. It is this disastrous misunderstanding which assumes that Christian unity is primarily membership within the 'fold' of the Christian Church instead of being primarily union with Christ, the Shepherd of all the sheep. It was this disastrous misunderstanding which culminated in the monstrous doctrine 'Outside the Church there is no salvation' (*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*) emphasized in St. Cyprian's *dictum*, 'He who has not the Church for his mother cannot have God for his father.'

The author of the Fourth Gospel reverses this method of putting second things first. He records Jesus as praying in His high priestly prayer': 'That they all may be one as Thou, Father, art in me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us: that the world may believe that Thou hast sent me.' (*Jn.* xvii, 21.) For St. John, union with the Divine Father through Him Who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, is the true source of Christian unity. Church reunion efforts must begin there. They must go back to Jesus. They must 'hurry back' to Him and learn of Him. It is in the seeking to become the disciples of the historic Jesus and in striving to realize the secret of His Gospel of the Kingdom of God that Christians must find the one sound basis for their spiritual and moral fellowship in reunion.

When we return to the Jesus of history and His Gospel of the Kingdom we find ourselves in the presence of a unique religion, supremely spiritual, unflinchingly moral and essentially compre-

hensive, under the inspiration of which men while dwelling in the temporal sphere pass into the eternal.

The postulates of this religion are the existence of one God of infinite power, wisdom and goodness: the Creator of the Universe, and the Father of men who are created in His likeness. It postulates the existence of a spiritual world in which dwell spiritual beings, good and evil. It postulates a future life for human beings who are possessed of free-will and moral responsibility and are treated as such by God. Men are 'the children of the Highest' and their duty as such is summed up in the Two Great Commandments:

> 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and with all thy mind and with all thy strength, and thy neighbour as thyself.'

In the Seven Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount the distinctive characteristics of the sons of the Kingdom are enshrined. He who possesses them becomes a son of the Kingdom: he passes into that Kingdom and that Kingdom passes into him. In the Gospel of Jesus 'the Kingdom of the Heavens' is the spiritual and moral *summum bonum*: 'Eternal Life' is its synonym in the Fourth Gospel. The sons of the Kingdom are 'the salt of the earth' which preserves it from moral corruption. They are also 'the light of the world' which delivers it from religious obscurantism.

Next to the emphasis on love (spiritual, moral, rational, not necessarily emotional) in the Religion of Jesus is His emphasis on faith — trust in the power, wisdom and goodness of God. 'All things are possible to him who has faith,' said Jesus. This is because faith is the medium through which God is enabled to operate in human life in a way in which He could not operate without the co-operation of human faith. By faith the sick in body and mind are restored to health and sanity. By faith men are delivered from carking cares and querulous anxieties. By faith men are enabled to remove mountains of obstruction and opposition. This faith is the inspiration of the Lord's Prayer, which is not sectarian. To identify this faith with the profession of credal forms and dogmatic beliefs is to misconceive its real nature.

The Lord's Prayer is also significant of the Religion of Jesus in another way. In the order of its petitions it puts the spiritual before the material — but it does not exclude the material. 'Thy Kingdom come' precedes 'Give us this day our daily bread.' 'Seek first,' said Jesus, 'the Kingdom of God and its righteousness and all things needful for this life shall be added unto you.'

Penitence has its place and efficacy in the Religion of Jesus.

It is created in the breast of the Prodigal Son when 'he came to himself' — it is a restoration of moral sanity, and makes Divine forgiveness possible, and the grant of this forgiveness gives infinite joy to the Divine Father:

> 'There is,' said Jesus, 'more joy in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth than over ninety-and-nine keepers of the *Torah*.'

A saying which to the Jewish authorities must have seemed as blasphemous as it was absurd. But the forgiveness man needs from God he must be ever ready to extend to his fellow-man if he himself is to receive forgiveness.

Two remarkable features of the Religion of Jesus are its reverence for the child (for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven) and its recognition of the spiritual qualities of women. Many of the scholars of Jesus were women.

Not less notable in the Religion of Jesus is what He excludes. He rejects uncompromisingly the demand for miracles as a proof of Divine Revelation and as a witness to the spiritual authority of His Gospel. He excludes all externalism even to the point of advocating secretiveness in religion:

> 'Go into thy chamber and shut thy door and pray unto thy Father in secret';
>
> 'When thou givest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.'

He condemns the practice of religious vows and the casuistry which seeks to excuse their evasion. He excludes all legalism in religion — obedience to regulations as regulations; the observance of ordinances as ordinances. It is loyalty to the underlying principle of the precept which He demands.

The Religion of Jesus excludes all asceticism — the formal practice of restrictions as religious obligations — fasting, the distinction of clean and unclean foods, ceremonial ablutions, even the rules of Sabbath observance. On the other hand, it demands heroic self-sacrifice in the cause of the Kingdom, in the service of which a man is ready if needs be to lose his own soul.

This is the religion of 'the Beloved Son,' of whom all who do the Will of God as He taught it are brethren. (*Mk.* iii, 35; *Heb.* , 11.) We have here a religion of intense simplicity, intense sincerity, intense spirituality and intense humanity: 'My yoke is easy and my burden is light.'

The vices which are the deadliest enemies of the Religion of Jesus are hardness of heart and hypocrisy. It has been called the religion of a lay man for lay men, but it is better described as the religion of the last and greatest of Israel's prophets: 'What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justice, love kindness, and

walk humbly with thy God.' It lacks everything that a priestly religion values : it has no sacrificial system : it has no priesthood. Its leaders are teachers and they have no pre-eminence over each other.

> 'The Kings of the Pagans lord it over them, but not so shall it be with you : he that would be greatest let him become the servant of all.'

This religion of Jesus is without institutions, without ordinances, without a hierarchy. As a consequence, it seemed to the Jewish authorities to be no religion at all; indeed an anti-religious movement.

This understanding of the true nature of the Religion of Jesus must not only underly but also dominate and direct all policies for Christian reunion.

When in the light of this Religion of Jesus we examine modern Christendom and its schisms what do we find? We find that the great positive affirmations of the Religion of Jesus constitute the underlying unities of modern Christendom at least in ideal if not in practice — all say the Lord's Prayer — but we find something else not less significant, that the things which divide modern Christendom are not included in the Religion of Jesus.

These divisive things may be true or they may be false : they may be useful or they may be hindrances, but they are not included in His Gospel of the Kingdom. It would astonish traditionalist Christians to learn to how many Church doctrines this statement applies. It would also astonish them to learn to how many church institutions and practices this statement applies. It is the modern critical study of the Scriptures, Christian origins and Church history which has brought this home to us to-day. Christians who believed in the infallibility of Scripture : Christians who believed in the infallibility of the Church : Christians who believed in the infallibility of the Pope were compelled by these beliefs to accept as infallibly true and divinely authorized many doctrines, institutions and practices which can no longer sustain their claims at the bar of scientific and historical research.

No policy of Christian reunion may insist on any of these things being included as essentials in a reunited Christendom. On the other hand, no policy of Christian reunion may prohibit their retention by communities or individuals who feel they ought to retain them (provided they do not insist on these things being essential for others). A sound policy of reunion must make allowance for the different levels of enlightenment, the various degrees of education, and the inherited traditions and personal idiosyncracies of those who ought of necessity to be included in the re

nited Christian fellowship. Uniformity, the idol of bureaucrats whether civil or ecclesiastical, must be abandoned.

Nevertheless there are, on the other hand, the claims of truth, nd we need in the light of our ideals of modern scientific educaion to take these claims of truth very seriously. In the reunited Church the right to claim and teach these findings must be recogized. This is demanded not only by the spirit of truth but also y the spirit of freedom and love. Loyalty to the Religion of esus demands this, for as St. Paul wrote, 'With freedom did Christ set us free'; 'Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is berty.' In the reunited Church there must be a freedom of faith nd practice which has to go right back to Jesus Himself for its stification as expressed in the words of St. John, 'him that ometh unto me I will in no wise cast out.'

Spiritual inspiration, moral influence, the beauty and attracon of Christian fellowship as the means and the only means of ecuring order and unity in a reunited Christian Church must take ie place of ecclesiastical dictatorship, ecclesiastical totalitarianm and ecclesiastical discipline. The practice of excommunication, erived not from Jesus but from Judaism, must be abandoned. he reunited Church must be a voluntary Church into the fellowhip of which men enter because they desire to follow Jesus as heir Lord and Leader and to be united to those seeking to realize nd promote His Religion. They must be free to enter without ogmatic professions and without promises — their goodwill must uffice. Moreover, they must be free to abide in the fellowship of e reunited Church for as long as they desire. None may cast em out against their will. If they go out they go out voluntarily. s St. John wrote:

> 'They went out from us because they were not of us: if they had been of us they would doubtless have continued with us.'

his Spirit of Truth and Freedom has its foundation in the Spirit Love, with which faith and hope are united. (*I Cor.* xiii.) ence the motto for Church reunion must be: In essentials unity; non-essentials liberty; in all things charity.

This conception of the constitution and character of the reited Christian Church will seem as anti-Christian to many ofessing Christians to-day as the Religion of Jesus seemed antiligious to contemporary Judaism. They will ask: Where does e Catholic Church come in? It must be answered that where its atholicism is not in harmony with the Religion of Jesus, it will t come in at all. When an ardent Catholic said to Dean Inge, 'Catholicism is as old as Christianity,' the Dean replied, 'Yes and great deal older.'

We have to recognize that while there is a truly Christian element in Catholicism there is also a sub-Christian element. This sub-Christian Catholicism, the product of primitive numinous emotion organized under the influence of legalist Judaism and imperialist paganism, will describe our reunited Christian Church as the 'Great Mother of Confusion'—and so it may seem to be in its externals. Nevertheless this reunited Christian Church, derived from and inspired by the Spirit of Jesus, will possess a comprehensiveness such as none of the sectarian Christian Churches possesses to-day. It will be endowed by its spirit of truth, freedom and love with a power of attraction for vast multitudes of modern men which no sectarian Church enjoys to-day. It will also possess a quality of spiritual and moral evolution which will make it the most influential of religious forces in shaping a world-wide civilization. This is the kind of Church reunion which not only the Christian Religion needs but also which world civilization needs. Within this reunited Church there will be a place for all except the obscurantist, the intolerant and tyrannical — the enemies of truth, freedom and love.

As the constitution of this reunited Christian Church must at the outset, and perhaps always, consist of a federation of Christian denominations, we are compelled, as practical men, to ask by what practical steps is this reunited Church to be implemented? Of course the greatest factor in creating such a reunited Christian Church must be Christian education, loyal to the Religion of Jesus, to scientific truth and to modern experience. This education ought to be undertaken wherever possible by the State as well as by the Church.

There are two practices which ought to be advocated and authorized at once by the leaders and representatives of the sectarian denominations.

The first practice is interdenominationalism. 'All who profess and call themselves Christians' should be admitted to fellowship in any or all of these separated denominations without being expected to renounce full membership in their own denomination, the motive inspiring this interdenominationalist movement being that all who practise it desire to be 'one in Christ' and recognize that separatist Christianity is not only an anomaly and an offence but belongs to an outmoded past.

> 'Our little systems have their day;
> They have their day and cease to be:
> They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.'

The second practice needed at once is inter-Communion by all

Christian denominations desiring reunion. This means that each Church would invite and welcome communicant members of all other Christian Churches to join with it in the Lord's Supper. The Lord's Supper is recognized by all Christian bodies as the sacrament of Christian Unity. But a sacrament rightly understood is not primarily a symbol of a spiritual state which already exists, but is an effective symbol which, rightly used, brings into existence that which it symbolizes.

The Sacrament of Unity ought therefore to be used as a means of effecting unity, and this necessitates its use as a most important factor in initiating the promotion of reunion and not merely as the seal of a unity already achieved. In short, inter-Communion should come at the *beginning* of the process of reunion, and not only at the end of the process as the appropriate symbol of the consummation of that union.

Much of the objection to inter-Communion with those who belong to other Christian denominations is due to the underlying feeling that the Holy Table is owned by its Church. Were it recognized that the Table is the Lord's Table, of which the clergy are servants and all who come are guests, the spirit of exclusiveness which 'fences the Table' would be banned, and not only would no objection be felt to inter-Communion by those of other Christian denominations but persistence in exclusiveness would become abhorent.

Another underlying objection to inter-Communion arises from the differing eucharistic doctrines held by separated Churches. These differing sacramental doctrines ought to be viewed as different interpretations of the same spiritual experience. The transubstantiation of the Roman, the con-substantiation of the Lutheran, the commemoration of the Zwinglian, the Real Presence of the Anglican are essentially expressed and unified in Queen Elizabeth's affirmation:

> 'Christ was the Word that spake it
> He took the bread and brake it
> And what His Word doth make it
> That I believe and take it.'

To-day the Anglican Communion among the separated Churches, like the Commonwealth of Nations among the rival nationalities of mankind, occupies a key position for achieving unification, but the policy of unification has in each case to be preceded and accompanied by a policy of Reform. In the case of the Commonwealth of Nations, unification must depend upon a sound policy of democratization. In the case of the Anglican Communion it must depend upon a sound policy of Christianiza-

tion, not a rejection of values but a rearrangement in their order, putting first things first.

Should the Anglican Communion fail in its effort to unite the separated Churches in the manner we have outlined its effort will not have been in vain, for it will have demonstrated that if the Religion of Jesus is to achieve its part in unifying and uplifting our world civilization it must replace the existing ecclesiastical organizations by a new and yet very old mode of Christian fellowship—divine sonship and human brotherhood in the Kingdom of God.

'Who knoweth whether thou art come to the Kingdom for such a time as this?'

ISAAC WATTS—THE MAN, HIS MIND AND MESSAGE*

By the Rev. Dr. C. J. Wright, St. Augustine's College, Canterbury

'My soul is athirst for God, yea, even for the Living God.'
—*Ps.* xlii, 2 (Prayer Book Version)

ISAAC Watts, the pioneer and, as I think, the greatest and deepest of English hymn-writers, was born in French Street, Southampton, on July 17th, 1674, and died 200 years ago on November 25th, 1748, in Abney House, Stoke Newington. That is why we unite here now to thank God. For he did more to help us to sing, with our minds as well as our voices, than any other English writer. Reason speaks, and religion sings, in him. Joseph de Maistre said: 'Reason can speak. It is love that sings.' Coventry Patmore said: 'All realities will sing; nothing else will.' Eternal Reality has sung to us, for us, and through us, by Isaac Watts. And not only *us* here to-night. Three weeks ago, on Remembrance Sunday, in nearly every cathedral in our British land and Commonwealth, every church, chapel, meeting-house of our kith and kin, we sang his immortal Hebraic hymn:

'O God, our Help in ages past.'

It will be sung as long as this planet endures, or as man dwells here in time and space. Perhaps also in the 'Land of Pure Delight'—and Progress and Service. For both hearts and minds will *always* sing of the wonder and glory and grace of the Living God.

* A Memorial Sermon delivered in Canterbury Cathedral on November 28th, 1948.

I. His Times

Isaac Watts was born in the year that Milton died. As our greatest epic poet left the world our deepest hymn-writer entered it. Thus the heritage of strong, stern and simple Puritanism flowed on, and the bright succession ran. But Puritanism wedded to Humanism, and Humanism rooted and grounded in God. Without which trinity our people will never be truly one, and never fulfil its future mission on earth. *O England! Awake! Awake! Jerusalem thy sister calls!* Calls to-day through this Englishman who died two hundred years ago: died just as the great enlargement of our human Empire was at the door — in Canada, India, Australia, and the islands of the seas. Wolfe of Westerham in this county was 21 when Watts died. Clive was 23. Isaac Watts died, too, just as the religious revival was spreading like a flame in a forest. John Wesley, our great itinerant evangelist, was 45. Charles Wesley — Isaac Watts' younger brother in Christian song and the poet of the evangelical revival — was 41. A wonderful time indeed! A strange, and turbulent, and uncertain time — a microcosm of our own.

Isaac Watts saw as a boy the exit of the Stuart kings. As a minister of Christ he saw the entrance of the Hanoverians. He preached a striking sermon in the Independent Church of Mark Lane on the death of George I on June 18th, 1727. In the preface to this when published — reluctantly, after many requests — he wrote: 'I must acknowledge, that when any great and momentous changes arise in the world, it is my custom, in the course of my ministry, to excite my hearers to a pious notice and improvement of them.'

His age was one of eager thought and scientific exploration. Watts was born eight years after Isaac Newton (notice the two 'Isaacs' of meditation, like their biblical forebear according to the spirit) — after Isaac Newton had been stabbed into wonder by the fall of the apple, according to Voltaire's familiar anecdote. While our greatest scientist was delving into the mysteries of space, John Locke, our eminent philosopher, was probing into the mysteries of the human mind. Evelyn and Pepys were writing history without knowing it. Christopher Wren was trying to rebuild London. John Bunyan had been released from his Bedford prison two years before Watts was born. And the 'Royal Society' was then eleven years old. Comenius, the great Czech and the father of modern education, had died in Amsterdam four years before. A wonderful era indeed—for England, and for mankind!

And I am bound to say here a brief word about France. For Watts was, through his grandmother, of Huguenot descent. The

first Huguenots had escaped across the Channel from the fury of the St. Bartholomew Day massacre in the time of Elizabeth (1572). Evil time! But blessed time for England! The weekly Huguenot service in this cathedral crypt — begun in 1550 — has flowed on, with but a short break in Mary's time, since then. A testimony to the Christian principle expressed by Archbishop Tillotson to a Prebendary in this cathedral: 'Charity is Above Rubrics'! Fifteen years before Watts became minister at Mark Lane, the Edict of Nantes had been revoked, and the Protestants of France were once more on the march. Isaac, indeed, was a child of persecution — both through his mother and father. For when he was a babe his father was in prison in Southampton for his religious convictions.

In the year he died Voltaire, the prince of ironic and prophetic mockery, was disconcerting all the thoughtful among the faithful, while Rousseau was meditating his *Contrat Sociale* (though it did not appear until 1762): in it he sought to base all government on the consent, direct or indirect, of the governed. (O All Ye Modern Totalitarians! What an electrifying and provocative opening sentence both for eighteenth-century France and our own enchained world, 'Man is born free, and everywhere he is in chains'!) . . . These, very briefly, were *his times*.

II. The Man: his Mind and Work

He was a striking and unusual combination of hymnist, preacher, thinker and mystic; but he is, first and foremost, our pioneer English hymn-writer. Here I wish now to say that this hymnist's spirit and message were begotten of persecution. Even here the Huguenot Clément Marot was his hymnist-forebear. In every age the blood of the martyrs — the *witnesses* through blood and sweat and poverty and tears — has been the seed of the Church. It will always be so. Christ told us so — by lip, life and death. There is no other way. It was so with the Psalmist: 'My tears have been my meat day and night.' Those tears only move those who *know*. Isaac Watts *knew*. That is why he *had* to translate David into Christ. That is why, when still a youth, he *had* to begin that uncannily prophetic first hymn thus:

> 'Behold the glories of *the Lamb*
> Amidst His Father's throne;
> Prepare *new* honours for His name,
> And *songs before unknown.*'

His songs *were* 'new,' and *were* 'before unknown.' . . . and that is why in his hymns there is the majesty of eternity, and the ecstasy of suffering, and the joy of serenity, and the mystery of God. That is why they move *all* men, and especially when, as in

days like these, we deeply feel, and truly think, and greatly wonder, *and*, if we *consent* to respond, divinely worship and humbly serve.

Isaac Watts was never a 'political nonconformist.' He was a spiritual and moral 'dissenter' — in the sense that to him, as to most of us to-day, the duties and convictions of Spiritual Community must never be usurped by, or surrendered to, Temporal Power. He would, I believe, have warmly approved the kind of Establishment achieved during this generation in Scotland, with the approval both of State and Church. To Caesar the things of Caesar! To God the things of God!

It was not, then, because he was politically-minded that he refused, sadly, to go to one of our ancient universities. He went to a Nonconformist Academy (in Stoke Newington) because he felt he must be loyal in a contentious era to spiritual convictions. And, you must remember, Archbishop Secker, Isaac Watts' dear, true and devoted friend, was educated in a Nonconformist Academy (in Gloucester), as also was Bishop Butler. I say these things that we may be just and truthful. In which things are a parable — dare I say an 'analogy'? — for to-day.

In 1707 he published his *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*, the first really modern hymn-book in England. It was in three parts: the first, paraphrases from Scripture; the second, hymns proper; the third, songs for the Lord's Supper. At once it spoke to multitudes. But—another uncanny fact of time—Charles Wesley was born in the same year. He learned to sing from Watts' hymns. I will not compare them here, for both belong to the Church Universal. Perhaps the best figure to describe both their identity and difference is this cathedral. Watts' hymns are the late Norman choir built over the Norman crypt: Wesley's the Perpendicular Gothic nave. And perhaps the massive Norman will stand longer than the soaring Gothic. Who knows? And who dare say? And in any case the cathedral is now one-indivisible and divine: like God Himself, and like His created universe.

Isaac Watts' mind was cosmic in its sweep, its range and its depth. He was objective without being abstract, and subjective without being sentimental. He was lost in the immensity, the majesty, the wonder of nature and the grace of the ever-living God. The Spirit which dwelt in Eternity worked in Nature and in History! 'My Father worketh continuously until now,' said Christ. Not just *then*, but *now*! Not just *there*, but *here*. Not just in what we in our ignorance call 'miracle,' but what we in our same ignorance call 'law.'

He was clearly in the stream of all the imaginative and intui-

tive philosophers and theologians from Plato to Pascal, and from the author of *Job* to the author of *St. John*. For the narrow and rigid dogmatist of every age—for all who declared that God had spoken and now was silent save in *this* place, *this* mode, *this* rite, even this 'silence,' this 'formlessness,' this 'freedom'—he prayed, as well as for himself:

> 'Come Holy Spirit, heavenly Dove,
> With *all* Thy quickening powers.'

And to the modern dialectic materialist, who thinks the last word of wisdom has been spoken in 'material' forces, and in 'economic' needs and demands, he sings in what I think is his deepest and sublimest hymn:

> 'God is a name my soul adores,
> The almighty Three, the eternal One;
> Nature and grace, with *all* their powers,
> Confess the Infinite unknown.'

Watts was much too intelligent to be any kind of 'materialist.'

I do not speak here about his theological and philosophical works, though this I *must* say now: that as an educationalist, as a thinker and as a religious seer he made a contribution far in excess of this age's remembrance of him. Long before our 'modern dialectic theologians' he had thought their thoughts, and *translated them*. My soul is athirst *for God*.' What would he have said to the perplexed and divided religious thinker of this puzzled and muzzled era who once was heard arguing vehemently against 'the validity of religious experience'? He said: 'To argue for the existence of God on the basis of man's experience of God is like trying to convince a thirsty traveller that there is an oasis quite near because he is so thirsty.' The psalmist, whom Watts interpreted and baptized into Christ, would have answered: 'My soul is athirst for God, *for the Living God*': that is, for the God who speaks *in* this thirst, and *to* this thirst, and *by* the water He has provided. . . . *No*, let not the sceptical theologians deny the secret of flight because they are afraid to walk. Fascists of the spirit!

He was too great a hymn-writer to be one of England's great poets. Hymns *must* be serious, solemn, even at times sermonic The loftiest poetry of spiritual loneliness soars higher than the spiritual songs written for the congregation. Lowell spoke for every hymn-writer when he said: 'I shall never be a poet until I get out of the pulpit.' Watts himself wrote: 'It was not my design to exalt myself to the rank and glory of poets, but I was ambitious to be a servant of the Churches and a helper to the joy of the meanest Christian.' Agreeing with Isaac, John Wesley said:

'That which is of infinitely more moment than the spirit of poetry is the spirit of piety.'

So even his immortal hymns for children, though light and smiling, are yet serious and sad. Here are a few verses from his *Divine Songs for Children*:

'In books and work and healthful play
Let my first years be past,
That I may give for every day
A good account at last.'

Or this—from a Cradle Hymn which my mother used to sing:

'Hush! my dear, lie still and slumber,
Holy angels guard thy bed!
Heavenly blessings without number
Gently falling on thy head.'

And surely everyone has heard this verse (remember that he was just over five feet in height—like many leaders of thought and action):

'Were I so tall to reach the pole.
And grasp the ocean in my span,
I must be measured by my soul:
The mind's the standard of the man.'

He had the humility of mind that always goes with deep and true religion. From his Saviour he had learnt to love children, their minds and their ways. Only a lover of children could have written as he did for them — both in hymn- and in lesson-book. Samuel Johnson spoke a final word here when he said (in, of course, his *Lives of the Poets*): 'Every man, acquainted with the common principles of human action, will look with veneration on the writer who is at one time combatting Locke, and at another making a catechism for children in their fourth year. A voluntary descent from the dignity of science is perhaps the hardest lesson that humility can teach.' Johnson, indeed, held Watts 'in veneration'—'a man who never wrote but for a good purpose' (Boswell). This humble-minded thinker and singer was yet recognized by one of the greatest of our universities. Edinburgh awarded him the D.D. in 1728.

III. His Message, Then and Now

It was, and is, an undying message. Watts, in his deepest hymns, as also in the occasional flights of his prose writings, and in the mystical soundings of his imaginative faculty, did not belong to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The intellectual framework of his theology and philosophy *was*, of course, *dated* and *placed*. 'The things which are seen are temporal.' But 'deep calleth unto deep.' The *Living* God speaks to the humble

and teachable human spirit. It is *then* that *Eternity Acts*, and *Time* is *Transcended*, and the *Living Water Flows*, and the *Hearts of All Men* are *Opened*, and *Heaven Comes Down* our *Souls* to *Greet*, and *Glory* crowns the *Mercy-seat*. As John Wesley the evangelist was greater far than John Wesley the administrator, so was Isaac Watts the seer deeper far than Isaac Watts the theologian. The truest and finest harvest of our English Reformation was the New Song of the Church — not Polemical Dialectic.

Thus I must not thwart the message of Watts by dwelling upon 'old unhappy far-off things and battles long ago' in which he had his place and part. His message was:

(1) *That man needs God, as he needs air, and water, and bread.* No one can truly live who starves his soul. That is why people everywhere are suffering from a deficiency disease to-day. This disease shows itself in a thousand ways—the divorce courts, the police courts, 'ca-canny' in the office, the workshop, the mine, the study, and (dare I say?) in the pulpit and the pew. Also, in our homes, where so many children look in vain to their parents for discipline and guidance in the deep things. A whole generation has arisen which has been starved by its parents. Through the care of 'The State' stomachs have been remembered, but souls have been forgotten. Can anything ever be right thus? How impossible! *Yet* nothing is impossible for the Living Spirit of the Living God.

Isaac Watts wrote and spoke, like the psalmist, of the LIVING God. 'My soul is athirst for God, for the LIVING God.' Not for the DEAD God: not for the God whom modern agnostics have denied: not for the God who is 'silent in these latter days': not for the God of the prophet's mockery — 'no doubt He is asleep, or peradventure on a journey,' sitting in His heaven and doing nothing. GOD COMES TO US TO-DAY — and HERE AND NOW. TO-DAY, if you will hear His voice, HARDEN NOT YOUR HEARTS.

What we need to-day — imperatively need — IS GOD. Until this basic need of all human souls is met, and this final food found, we shall drift to perdition and death. *It is God* who is glorified in the hymns of Watts — *never man.*

In this age of uncertain yet determined transition few, alas, are concerned about the transcendent themes which engrossed this man's thought and life. To-day's 'deists' are 'dialectic materialists.' Watts in contending against the 'deists' was an apologist for *the Eternal and Undefinable God* who was Self-revealed in Nature and History, and who:

(2) *Has Spoken in Jesus Christ* and Provided this FOOD. Jesus Christ was to Isaac Watts what He was and is to the Fathers of

Lambeth, CROWN AND CRITERION OF ALL REVELATION. By many narrow and militant minds he was regarded as a heretic. But they were never able so to lay their traps that they could seize him, as they wanted, on this central faith and conviction, though often they were caught in the nets they had laid, as in the days of the psalmist — and of Jesus. (The disciple is not above his Master.') I will not speak here about Watts' speculations on the Person of Christ, but one thing must be said. Christ and His Cross is central, basic, and pinnacle, of his message. His first hymn was one of praise to Christ. 'Behold the glories of the Lamb.' The final volume of his sermons published the year before he died was all about the Gospel of Christ, in Christ, to Christ, about Christ. (In contrast to the first volume of his sermons.) THE LAMB! 'THE LAMB SLAIN FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD' — that was his great text, as it was the theme of his most poignant hymn — the greatest hymn ever written to many noble souls like Matthew Arnold:

'When I survey the wondrous cross.'

And here I *must* say just a few sentences about the most remarkable prophesy he, to my knowledge of him, ever proclaimed. It was—how truly significant!—when writing his very last work on The Person of Christ that he suddenly saw, had given to him, a vision of THE ATOMIC AGE. 'If a soul had but a full knowledge and command of all the atoms of one solid foot of matter, which according to modern philosophy is infinitely divisible, what strange and astonishing influences would it have over this world of ours? What confusions might it raise in distant nations, sending pestilential streams into a thousand bodies and destroying armies at once? And it might scatter benign or healing and vital influences to as large a circumference.'

Truly Isaac was among the prophets.

(3) *That there is a* LIFE ETERNAL. No Gospel can ever answer our human questions, or bring inspiration for life's urgent duties, unless it is grounded in eternity. 'Heaven,' 'Hell,' 'Judgment' are all poor human terms to express a Faith — a Faith that man is by nature a child of the Living God, and that throughout this earthly pilgrimage the Divine Spirit is seeking to lead him, and to redeem him, and to enrich him, for the service of eternity. We have a Pilot; we have a Compass; we have a Bourn.

Isaac Watts spoke to and for all human hearts in that most beautiful of all hymns about the future life — in the vivid figures and metaphors of the Bible:

'There is a land of pure delight.'

That life is a fellowship—a fellowship of all the saints of all th ages. As in his most moving of all hymns for All Saints' Day :

> 'Give me the wings of faith to rise
> Within the veil and see
> The saints above, how great their joys,
> How bright their glories be.'

His dust lies in Bunhill Fields in City Road. His be memorial is the hymn-book of the Church. His memorial in ston is in Westminster Abbey. He belongs to this nation. No, h belongs to all nations. He belongs to the Church Universal. N he belongs to the ETERNAL KINGDOM.

At the foot of the modest inscription prepared by Watts him self for his tomb—engraved at the joint expense of Sir J. Hartop and Lady Abney—are the words

IN UNO JESU OMNIA.

MEMORIES OF RURAL CHURCH LIFE

By the REV. CANON EARLE, B.D., author of *Essays on Mediaeval Subjects*

IN the early eighties of the last century, while still a child, used to stay occasionally at the house of my grandmothe Ellerton Manor, near Richmond, Yorkshire.

One day, exploring in a large granary where there was miscellaneous collection of obsolete farm implements and othe gear, I came upon a piece which excited my curiosity. It was a ancient-looking saddle to which was attached a second form o saddle behind. If I remember correctly this was arranged side ways and had some sort of decoration by way of a fringe wit tassels. I ran to my aunt and persuaded her to come and view m find. 'Why, that is the old pillion,' she said, looking upon it her self with some considerable interest. 'Your grandmother, an those before her, used to ride behind their husbands.' 'Where di they ride to?' I asked. 'To visit friends, or to church, or some times to market. But run and ask your grandmother.'

So to my grandmother I ran, and breathless with the excite ment of my discovery told her that I had found the old pillion Her interest matched my own and it was plain that the old pillio had roused many recollections. Yes, she had sat upon it many time holding to her husband in front, and so had her husband' mother before her. This brought us well back into the seventee hundreds. 'And did you go to church upon it?' I asked. This le to a description of Sunday in a farmer's family some hundred an

fty years ago, and further back. The parish church was two miles way, and it was customary for the family to set out for morning ervice, my grandfather riding in front with his wife on the illion behind; the children running and playing around until pproaching the church, when they fell into some sort of order. t was a leisurely proceeding, for when they arrived at the lane eside the churchyard there was no immediate entry into the hurch. Neighbours would meet and pass the time of day, the amily from the Hall would arrive and linger for a word with one nd another. Presently the warning bell brought about a general ovement into church. My grandmother remembered that all the ilkmaids went to church in the morning, and all the men from ie farm in the afternoon, for which service they also returned. There was no evening service. The church was always full at both ervices. Very few except the sick and infirm were absent, and hose who stayed away were generally thought to have some not o creditable a reason for doing so. After church there was the ame leisurely dispersal. Neighbours and friends looked upon it s an opportunity for meeting and had questions to ask and subects to discuss. At first this picture may seem to have in it a susicion of compulsion. The children walking before their parents, he employed milkmaids and farm men attending in their groups. There was, however, no sense of compulsion, but the somewhat nquestioning acceptance of a proper custom. The parish was nuch more self-contained than now. The parish Vestry, of which he clergyman was chairman, looked after its own poor, and ttended to its own highways, had its own constable, and saw to ts own apprentices. All very imperfectly, no doubt, and the hurch, with its duties of many kinds, was looked upon as one nore of the functions of the parish. The rightness of religious bservance was accepted with little criticism or enquiry. The Easter Vestry was but one of many vestry meetings. That churchvardens should be appointed, as well as highway wardens, was ight and natural in the parish scheme of things, and there was a eneral customary acceptance of the clergyman and the ministraions of the Church.

The description of Sunday in a Yorkshire village which my grandmother gave stayed in my mind. I had gazed up into her ace and had formed the picture which her words had painted. Sunday in a country village to-day does not compare altogether avourably with the scene of a hundred and fifty years ago. We an draw the comparison ourselves.

There have been some old customs prevalent in our rural eligious life within my own recollection which the passage of time

and circumstance have effaced, and with their disuse has gone a certain sense of pious sentiment and loss of religious value.

Ploughmen and ploughboys had a habit of song as they followed the furrow up and down the field, and it was a pleasant experience when returning from a visit to some distant farm to stand in the lane between the hedgerows and listen to the singing coming from the fields. In the twilight or the gloaming of an autumn or winter afternoon, while work was still in progress though little light remained, was a favourite moment to listen—a voice perhaps near by, and another faintly from a distance. The singing was always of hymns, the well-known words and tunes not infrequently from the church service of the preceding Sunday evening. Such voices are silent now; instead there rise the harsh mechanical sounds of the tractor, of which perhaps three or four can be discerned near and far.

Another lost custom was associated with the Burial Service. Imagine the Vicar standing robed in the church porch waiting for the mournful procession. His first intimation of the approach is not by sight but by sound. The words of a hymn are carried upon the air — 'Rock of Ages' or 'Abide with me' or 'Jesu, Lover of my soul.' A verse is sung, followed by a pause; then rises the tuneful sound again, rustic voices blending with the rustic surroundings. Again a pause, and again a verse, until the procession of mourners and villagers comes into sight, following the bearers or the country waggon, to the lych-gate and so into church. That scene has passed away. Instead, to-day, the motor hearse glides smoothly up, the mourning coaches follow; all is done efficiently and seemly, but in another way.

The courting of a youth and a maid always seemed to me to be begun in a consecrated way and in a beautiful setting, for the first intimation of it was that the two were seen together in church. Sitting together, kneeling side by side, perhaps by design sharing the same book. Thereafter the engagement was known to and accepted by all, for they had been to church together and continued the custom Sunday by Sunday. This, alas, is no longer so and the early association of two names is more likely to be that they have been seen together at 'the pictures.'

At one time it was usual for worshippers to bring their own service books to church. Everyone owned a Prayer Book, probably bound up with the hymnal, and not a few would carry a Bible too. Now people rely on finding a service book in church. But the old custom meant that people cared for their own book or books. And especially helpful to gaining a knowledge of the Bible was the custom of following the lessons as they were read, for here

much more is learned by sight than by sound. I have been told by persons whose memory went further back than my own, how a rustle was heard through the church when the leaves of many Bibles were turned together. Like the gentle rustle of wind through the corn. It is no doubt impossible to recapture or revive the spirit of an earlier age, a simple piety that time has breathed upon and blurred.

I came into the country in 1898, and my first Good Friday there impressed me deeply. There was service in the morning and again in the afternoon. On entering the church I was almost startled to find the building packed to the doors, and again the same in the afternoon, with men, women and children all dressed in Sunday clothes and prepared to take part in the service with intentness and reverence. The numbers equalled those at a Harvest Thanksgiving, and far surpassed the Sunday by Sunday congregations. The reason for this I found to be a long-established custom for all work to cease on the farms upon Good Friday. All men and women employed upon them were given a holiday, with the understanding that they attended the church services, or it may have been chapel.

At that date the Harvest Festival services were at the height of their well-deserved popularity. A neighbouring clergyman claimed to have introduced them into the East Riding when he came in 1854. Country people felt at once that here in the Harvest Service was a form of religion united to their daily work, and giving expression to it visibly in the fruits and flowers, corn and vegetables, and by the appropriate prayers, hymns, lessons and sermon in words they could understand. It was a general custom to invite friends from other parishes to tea that day and to go afterwards with their hosts to the Harvest Service. The consequence was that for some three weeks the village churches could hardly find room, whether standing or sitting, for the concourses that more than filled them in their turns. The Harvest Services continue popular, but not in the same degree, and those who are missed from them to-day are unfortunately frequently those for whom they were primarily intended.

Strange threads of belief and pagan survivals of good luck or evil enter here in common usage which favours baptism but does not seem to be applied to Holy Communion, except in cases as a deterrent. For baptism is still held to be potent for good luck and bodily health, and to neglect Churching is to risk some sort of retribution. It is safer or better to visit the house of the Lord before a neighbour's. I think this mixture of religion with superstition, of true sentiment with fear, has been due to the teaching

of village midwives, who have often said to me, 'I do not leave until she has been safely Churched.'

I have never found the Holy Communion resorted to as a talisman or safeguard; rather the other way. Stress has been laid on the 'unworthy receiving' and the penalties incurred thereby, so that an undefined fear has been stirred lest a hostile power should be roused, and the plea or excuse is made, 'I dursn't,' or 'I'm not good enough.'

NEW FAITH IN FREEDOM

By Raymond C. Knox, Chaplain-Emeritus of Columbia University

WHEN the question is asked, as many in our day with its perplexing, difficult problems are asking, What is religion for? Why should we cultivate and strengthen it in our lives? What does it do for us and what does it bid us do? What is the message and the power of religion to meet the deepest needs of men throughout the world?—this is the plain and positive answer. It is to set men free.

For to set men free was and is by explicit statement the distinctive purpose and achievement of Jesus Christ. That men might be free was, He proclaimed, the will of God for us; and whenever we speak of God's will we should think of freedom. So Jesus Christ, in perfectly doing the will of God, brought release to captives from whatever force or circumstance they were in bondage. (*Lk.* iv, 16-21). He liberated men's minds and lives from bondage to fear. He set men free from wrong beliefs and a defective knowledge of God by showing them their true relation to Him as Father. He brought them deliverance from captivity to sin and opened the way to a new life of freedom. He ministered to the poor, the afflicted and the handicapped that they might have greater freedom of life. He fearlessly attacked those who exploited their fellows for material gain, reducing them to servitude. He taught that all men knowing God as Father are to live in the freedom of brotherhood. He came to enable men actually to realize what true freedom is that they might possess and enjoy it in fullest measure. And 'if the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed.' (*Jn.* viii, 36.)

Because this was the purpose and the work of Jesus Christ, so did St. Paul lay stress on the further consequences. The followers of Jesus Christ are therefore to have freedom as their foremost responsibility and aim. They must defend it against all assaults,

promote its spread in the world, and make it triumphant in all realms of life.

At the time when St. Paul wrote his *Epistle to the Galatians*—which has rightly been called the '*Magna Charta* of Christian Freedom,'

> For freedom has Christ set us free; stand firm therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage (*Gal.* v, 1),

a most important document for us to read and study to-day — the question whether men would uphold or lose the freedom for which Jesus Christ had set them free was the critical issue, for some, by slackening their allegiance to Christ, were losing their faith in freedom. Some instead of living by the power of the Spirit, were making religion a matter of observing ceremonial ordinances. Some, claiming the name and the privilege of freedom, were living in selfish indulgence to the disregard and detriment of others.

It was this situation which caused St. Paul to make to his fellow-Christians his strongest appeal: 'For freedom has Christ set us free; stand firm, therefore, and be not entangled again in a yoke of bondage.' Especially did he make it clear to them that if freedom was to be upheld and increasingly won they must truly grasp what real freedom is. Their understanding of it had to be enlarged. They must press on to the full meaning and resolute practice of the freedom for which Christ had made them free.

Once again, and on a world-wide scale, freedom is now the critical issue. Everywhere it is 'exposed to a mighty challenge.' In certain European countries, where until recently we had thought that freedom was secure and destined to grow, it has been ruthlessly crushed and suppressed. A spurious ideology makes its appeal to people suffering from war and want, promising them plenty and peace, but which if accepted must stamp out every vestige of freedom and enslave them in bondage. An insidious propaganda, falsifying the world's freedom and democracy, seeks to befog the minds of men and make them its victims.

This places on all of us who sincerely love freedom an inescapable obligation and task. We must stand firm for freedom. In lands where freedom, though not yet fully grown, is indigenous and familiar, it is our greatest heritage. It is the secret which makes a nation prosperous and strong, and it can fashion into co-operating unity peoples of widely different races and cultures.

Shall we so live and act that the freedom which has been won for us at the cost of countless lives be maintained? Shall we make freedom our goal and by every effort and sacrifice not only pass it on unimpaired but advance it farther? For, as has been rightly

said, the only way to preserve the priceless gains of the past is to add to them.

Thus our greatest present necessity is not alone vigilantly to guard the freedom we have: we must do more. For we live in a new age, and

> 'New occasions teach new duties,'
> Time makes ancient good uncouth;
> They must upward still and onward
> Who would keep abreast of truth.'

To do this we must lay fresh hold of the nature and meaning of freedom which is in Christ. We must go forward to the larger understanding, practice and application of the freedom for which He set us free.

What are the essentials of freedom as we learn them from Him? When and how are we truly free? *We all demand freedom. What does freedom demand of us?* The broad background of Christ's teaching is His saying given in the *Gospel according to St. John*, 'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free' (viii, 32). And truth to be known must be *done* (iii, 21), not simply perceived by the mind.

There is a common notion that a man is free when he can do as he pleases. A man may be able to do as he pleases, but whether or no he is free depends upon what he pleases to do. He may if he pleases violate the known laws of physical health; but he will not be free, and if he persists he will destroy his own life. A man may ignore and violate the verifiable laws of the spiritual and moral life, but he thereby forges the chains of his own slavery.

So the freedom for which Christ sets us free is always founded on truth. And the first truth which He declared is the sacred character and supreme worth of every human personality. For so it is held in the sight and in the affection of God. In God is the Source and Foundation of freedom; not in a convention of men or in social custom. Man's life has been endowed with certain inalienable rights by God the Creator. From which it follows that every repressive condition, every form of oppression, every lack of opportunity, must be removed so that each human life by the proper exercise of the rights and talents God has given may come to fullest expression and development. The infinite worth of life in the sight of God, which is therefore to be treated accordingly in one's self and in all others, is the primary truth of the freedom wherewith Christ makes us free.

Second: while the freedom which comes from Christ is always personal, to be our individual possession, He made it emphatically plain that personal freedom can be completely realized only

as we learn and are willing to live in right relation to our fellowmen. For man was made for fellowship. No man lives unto himself alone. We are all members one of another. To this truth all modern knowledge testifies. And it is now sternly impressed upon nations by world events.

So Christ sets before us the great goal of the Kingdom of God. To have freedom requires that we seek *first* the Kingdom of God and His righteousness. For the Kingdom is that new and higher order of society in which men by conformity to the will of God have life and freedom through fellowship with Him and with one another and so enter into 'the glorious liberty of the sons of God.'

Is it not here that we find one of the weaknesses, the most conspicuous defect, in our ordinary conception of freedom? Have we not too long, too exclusively, thought of freedom in its limited, narrowly individual aspects? The result is that freedom is commonly defined — I believe in Law — as what a man has a right to do, 'so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others.' But this definition is far too negative. As William Temple once pointed out, freedom conceived in this limited, negative manner has been marked by 'self-assertiveness,' by the 'claim or demand for recognition of rights rather than of duty and of demand for opportunity of service.'

> 'It is,' he says, 'largely because the kind of liberty in people's minds has been this purely individual . . . self-assertive thing that it has so signally failed in some nations which have set up machinery for its expression.'

Our task is to rise above this restricted conception and to realize what true freedom demands in social responsibility and obligation. It is to be defined not negatively as what one has a right to do 'so long as he does not interfere with the rights of others,' but positively, as the fully developed life of each individual which is perfectly wrought out in the fellowship and in the service of men. For when a man devotes all his ability, his initiative, opportunities, in his daily occupation and elsewhere, to make his utmost contribution to human life, his own life reaches its highest fulfilment. He lives by the standard of Him who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. (*Mk.* x, 45.) In losing his life he finds it. (*Mt.* xvi, 25.) He is free!

The third and culminating truth of the freedom brought by Christ is that to be free we are to have as our motive an unfailing creative good-will or love. Love—translated in *I Corinthians* xiii of the King James Version, charity — is not simply a romantic, intense emotion. To love, as used in the New Testament, means

'to live constructively' (Streeter), more strongly, to live creatively. As St. Paul wrote, 'For all the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this: thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' (*Gal.* v, 14.) And 'Ye have been called unto liberty; only use not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve one another.' (*Gal.* v, 13.)

It is this divinely ethical motive of love by which we are most closely related to God that has in it the power to overcome all adverse conditions, create the new society, unite men in the brotherhood of mutual service, so that the life of freedom, spiritually and materially, becomes wholly realizable.

Such is the full measure of the freedom for which Christ set us free. As in loyalty to Him we have this as our goal it will awaken and augment in us fresh energy to attain it. It will enable us to demonstrate by deeds that we have the competence, the superior ability, to solve the huge problems by which we are confronted. It can counteract and banish the false ideologies that lead to tyranny. As we dedicate ourselves to Christ's purpose, government founded on freedom shall not perish but be as a city set on a hill that cannot be hid. By the doing of God's will, whose service is perfect freedom, shall freedom irresistibly spread throughout the world and cover the earth as the waters cover the sea. For

> 'Freedom is not to limit, but to share,
> And freedom here is freedom everywhere.'

For freedom has Christ set us free: stand firm, therefore. And where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. (*II Cor.* iii, 17.)

PRAYER IN THE RELIGION OF JESUS

By Henry Mick, M.A., S.T.D., Central United Church, Ontario

THE prayers of any person or people provide the most reliable guide to his or their inner life and highest aspirations. Prayers, of course, do not always reach moral perfection. Yet at prayer we find the worshipper at his highest, whatever that spiritual altitude may be. Man is never more reverent than when he appears to stand before God; and his sincerity is never freer from alloy than when he offers his supplication unto the Most High.

The prayers of Jesus lead us into the Holy of Holies of His great soul. This is especially true of the prayer known among us as 'The Lord's Prayer,' in that it was formulated with design as a guide for those who would sow the good seed of the Kingdom of God; and as a fitting expression of approach to the great Heavenly Father, communicated to disciples by a teacher who felt that their souls were in his keeping. Indeed, nowhere within

the Gospels is there to be found a more appealing and comprehensive epitome of the Master's mind and heart than in the prayer before us. This is high acclaim. Can it be justified?

I

Practical Catholicity. A little reflection reminds us of the widespread use of this prayer. The occasion may be one of joy, as that of a marriage; or it may be one of sorrow, as at a funeral; yet at each the Lord's Prayer is heard, and it is always fitting. Again, there may be a national or civic assembly, at which a common and ecumenical expression of devotion is required. When such events occur this prayer is frequently heard, and its charm is not dissipated by repetition. Among the earliest and most recurring of all the prayers we remember in the home, in the school, and in the church is the one whose study now engages us.

The attitude, too, is the same among adult worshippers, in specifically devotional services. A brother minister of the Church of England told me that he uses the Lord's Prayer two or three times in every service. This may appear excessive. Yet the stately worship of that Church is its great surety to a place among the things that abide. Of course, within the Free Churches the Prayer is seldom used more than once in any service. Yet, on the other hand, it is seldom omitted from the well-ordered diet of worship; and when this unfortunately does occur the worshipper departs with a haunting sense of loss.

But how does the case stand within the larger circle of Christendom, say, within the Roman Catholic Church? Let the relating of an incident indicate the reply. I once was invited with an Anglican clergyman and a Catholic priest to be present at the laying of the foundation of an extension to a large manufacturing plant. When all was ready to turn the first barrow of cement into the forms, the manager of the company requested me, his minister, to offer a prayer. This done, the Anglican rector was called upon and responded in like manner, with a brief extemporaneous prayer. Then the Catholic priest was named, and he as readily responded. What was the prayer? None other than this Prayer, and this Prayer only — in which we all joined. Thus for a moment there was neither Anglican nor Catholic nor Protestant, but all were one in a common prayer to a common God. But, sad to relate, at the conclusion of the Prayer our divisions again asserted themselves. We had dogmas other than those found in that Prayer; and prayers other than those 'after this manner.'

The question at once arises, what is the secret of this universal appeal? A complete answer may not be possible in words. There

are some things that no words can express. However, a partial answer can be given. In the first place the dévisive factors that have rent the Church and estranged the Children of God within the pale of Christianity are not to be found within the Lord's Prayer. There is nothing here concerning the inspiration of the Scriptures; nothing concerning the metaphysical relation of the Son to the Father; nothing concerning the Trinity; nothing concerning ecclesiastical government, whether episcopal, presbyterian or congregational; nothing concerning the number or the nature of the sacraments, whether two or seven, or whether the Eucharist is transubstantial or consubstantial; and nothing of the efficacy or mode of baptism. One might go on, but that is not necessary. It is abundantly clear that the battle-grounds of the creeds are not here. And yet our Master's direction is 'After this manner therefore pray ye.' The freedom of the Prayer from dévisive elements is, then, one factor, and an important one, in its universal appeal. A second factor in that appeal brings us to our next major consideration.

II

Selective Discernment. As a unit of devotion or worship the Lord's Prayer is conspicuously brief; yet its range encompasses the heart throes of the ages. The quest for God, the vision of a New Age, the cry for bread, the desire to escape the tyranny of debt, the struggle of the higher self against the engulfing treachery of temptation and the problem of evil have been the dominant and sincere pleadings of the soul in every age and under all skies.

The upward look to Deity, whether conceived as Person, Being, Energy or Cosmic Entity, offering an actual or hypothetical expression of our highest and most comprehensive aspirations and ideals, is exceedingly general, and supplies an immortal longing. Indeed, man without a God, and an upward look, is of all beings most miserable, because he is aware of inner urges the external counterpart of which his faith does not supply. He is like a man with ears to hear in a universe of haunting silence; or like one with eyes to see in a land of Egyptian midnight. Such an one sooner or later awakens to the realization that his philosophy has betrayed his soul.

Again, man needs God as a non-competing rallying centre. So penetrated is our civilization with pagan elements that we compete in almost everything, in politics, in business, in education; in the houses we build and the conveyances we drive. We even compete in the temples we dedicate to the worship of Almighty God; and in the monuments we rear over our beloved dead. Thus

it is that a non-competing rallying centre, especially when that centre is God, is a rock in a weary land to men and women distracted by endless dévisive influences. No one now thinks it possible to influence God by gold or silver or imposing bank accounts. We believe that God can be moved by one power and by one power only, and that is the ancient sacrifice of a broken spirit, a broken and a contrite heart, which God has never despised. This gives new hope to the humble.

The cry for the New Age, the Kingdom of God, is potent with meaning. Following the petition, 'Thy Kingdom come,' we have the nearest approach to a definition of the New Order, which Jesus envisaged, to be found within His teachings. It is 'Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven.' When one prayed for the advent of the Kingdom in Jesus' day it was from a heart brimming over with historic hope. An age of plenty was anticipated, when the wilderness and the solitary place would be glad, and the desert would rejoice and blossom as the rose. Peace was seen in all the earth, when the lion and the lamb would lie down together; and men would beat their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and learn war no more. Righteousness, too, would cover the land as the waters cover the great deep; and man would have no need to say to his neighbour 'Know the Lord,' for all would know Him from the least even unto the greatest. What was actually anticipated was that the middle wall of partition between heaven and earth would be broken down, and heaven would flood earth with its benign life. This and more was the hope of those who prayed 'Thy Kingdom come' in a land often harried by war and haunted by famine.

The petition for bread is very human. In it every man hears a prayer in his own tongue. If our desires are our prayers, and if 'prayer is the burden of a sigh,' then never was prayer more common than this petition for bread. The most dominant factor in determining conduct throughout the ages has been the economic, and the most powerful element therein has been the necessity of food. Yet as religious teachers we have urged men to believe the creeds; we have cried to them to flee from the wrath to come; and we have called upon them to attain heaven; when all the time their hearts yearned to pray after this manner, 'Give us this day our daily bread.' In giving this petition such a central place in this model prayer the great teacher demonstrated once again that 'He knew what was in man.'

Debts, too, have been the evil genii of the race. Men have been scourged for debt, have been imprisoned for debt, have

been sold for debt, have been slain for debt. One child of the race might pray, 'Loose us from our debts,' and all others of woman born might respond, 'So pray we all.' As I write these lines I am conscious that, unless divine grace touches the hearts of the nations in regard to debts, our international obligations will break the backs of generations yet unborn.

In speaking of the universal sweep of the petition 'Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors,' I am not thinking of material debts exclusively, exacting as they are. There are other debts :- to parents, to teachers, to physicians, to nurses, to pastors, to neighbours, to husband, to wife, to brother, to sister, to son, to daughter, which never, never can be paid with gold and silver or banknotes; and all of these beside our incomparable debt to God for His 'unspeakable gift.' These debts if ever paid, must be paid in 'kind,' with the pure love of unsullied souls, and undivided hearts; and not in corruptible things such as silver and gold. O God, forgive us our debts.

The vital connection between the Lord's Prayer and fundamental human needs is further seen in the petition for deliverance from the meshes of temptation. The careful reader of his New Testament is aware that the terms 'temptation' and 'evil' may have specific meanings here. This need not turn us aside. There is enough common ground between the specific and popular meanings to justify our deductions. Temptation is the encroachment of wrong upon the domain of right. Wrong is what experience has taught to be the enemy of the common good. It would be strange had not the Master of men formulated a petition covering this, for it is as widespread as human existence. It has been observed that evil thoughts, words and scenes cling to the mind with a tenacity which is almost fiendish. The cause of this undesirable state of affairs is probably due to the fact that we are heirs to every emotion, appetite and passion of our lower ancestry in field and forest, jungle and sea. Our present desires and emotional urges were begotten in the deep and in the wilds before the days of rational and ethical thinking. When man emerged and stood upright, he left many things behind him; and took on new auxiliary aids by which he scaled the heights which he now holds without rival. But, alas, there were woven into the fabric of his being elements which were not easily abandoned. These, man trailed with him, and has exhibited them upon a thousand battle fields, in the markets of the world; as also in drink and lust and pride. No prayer is complete without a petition for deliverance from the coils of the serpent; this prayer is no exception, and in this regard it is not found wanting.

III

Social Nature. Though very embarrassing to any interpretation of religion which is conceived in individualism and dedicated to the proposition of personal salvation, the social nature of the Lord's Prayer is compelling. There is not a 'God bless me' in it. Nor is there a 'God bless me and my wife, my son John and his wife, us four and no more' in it. If one desires salvation in 'splendid isolation' he must seek it elsewhere. On the contrary, we have these: '*Our* Father,' '*our* bread,' '*our* debts,' 'temptation,' 'lead *us* not into' and 'deliver *us* from evil.' Was ever prayer like unto this prayer? The shepherd here is not satisfied while even the hundredth sheep is in the wilderness.

'Our Father' is as catholic as the blue dome of heaven. In it we have state democracy, Christian philanthropy, racial solidarity and the foreign policy of the Church compressed into two words. It was bound to break the shell of Jewish exclusiveness, and to embrace the Syrian, the Phoenician, the Greek and the Roman. 'Our Father' stands without a limitation of race, colour, creed or tongue. Its sweep reaches the beggar by the way, the harlot on the street, as readily as it does the Herods and the Caesars on their thrones. Before the majestic strides of this Prayer, that teaches to pray, cliques, oligarchies, aristocracies, and even hierarchies go down to the tongueless silence of the dreamless dust; and men and women, young and old, rich and poor, high and low, stand as a common family before a common God. This is as it ought to be. 'After this manner therefore pray ye.'

'Our bread! Our debts'! These are not the heart throbs of some superman, or of a select group. They are as far-reaching as the mercy of God and the love of Jesus. Nor are they simply supplications to the God of Harvest for plenty, but reach out to the horrors of blockades, the tyranny of war debts, and the exploitation of our fields, whereby the ranks of both the idle poor and the idle rich are increased, and both are cursed thereby.

It is now becoming abundantly clear that no country can become superlatively rich through the anguish of another, or of several, and do so with impunity or even safety. If this policy is pursued the dogs of war strain at the leash, and none can say when the leash may snap. It is also becoming obvious that if God provided salvation for all — and at such a price — the first care of a nation is to provide bread, or at least work, for its sons and daughters. Only they pray this Prayer sincerely and fully who make every effort that no minds should be unskilled, and that no hands should be idle; that no bodies be dwarfed from hunger and no lives blighted by debt.

'Temptation'—'lead us not into.' Again, collective. The temptations of the present, if not unique, are none the less insidious—power, pleasure and prominence are 'three graces' which have appeared, in every age, clothed in purple and fine linen. They fare sumptuously, but they feed upon the souls of men. It is well that we should be confronted with their collective nature. We are members one of another. An inordinate pace is set in external things. Comparison, pride and envy are aroused. Money must be had. Men gamble; women sell their bodies. What of those who set the pace? Can they pray with impunity, 'Lead *us* not into temptation, but deliver *us* from evil'?

The universal appeal of this Prayer probably has been without parallel among the expressions of worship within Christendom; penetrating its selective discernment; daring its social nature; profound its teaching. Yet its greatest element remains to be mentioned. While the Master went in and out among His fellows, performing deeds of mercy and disseminating His immortal teaching, there crept from His life into theirs the magic of His wondrous spirit. In certain cases this subtle power adhered to His words. Nowhere is its presence more felt than in connection with this simple but incomparable Prayer. The central reason why it has been used ten thousand times ten thousand, and the reason why it will be used while devout men extend holy hands toward Zion, is because of the spirit that pervades it.

THE LIBERAL JEW AND THE LIBERAL CHRISTIAN

By The Editor

DR. Israel Mattuck, the beloved Rabbi of the Liberal Jewish Synagogue in the Metropolis, has done good service to English Judaism by the publication of his treatise *The Essentials of Liberal Judaism.*[1]

The book serves a double purpose. It presents Judaism to Jews, especially young Jews, in a noble, enlightened, practical manner. We can imagine no better book to put into the hands of Jewish youth in this country. It is a fine example of what the best kind of English education can do for the adherents of the great religions in helping them to achieve that higher synthesis which the Religion of Humanity demands for purposes of world unity.

The second good purpose served by this book is its creation

[1] *The Essentials of Liberal Judaism,* by Israel Mattuck, A.M., D.H.L. (Broadway House, London, 1947; 8/6.)

among non-Jewish readers of a sympathetic understanding of Liberal English Judaism. There is much need for this sympathetic understanding to-day. No readers of Rabbi Mattuck's volume can fail to realize that the only kind of Judaism which can break down the middle wall of partition which separates Judaism as a whole from the non-Jewish world is such a Liberal Judaism as Rabbi Mattuck presents and expounds.

There are many things in Liberal Judaism in which the Liberal Jew is much closer to the Liberal Christian than he is to the traditionalist Christian, but much remains to be accomplished in this field. The Liberal Christian is repelled, not by the racial nationalism of the Jew, but by his religious nationalism. The Liberal Christian is convinced that when the Jewish people rejected the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, proclaimed by Jesus, they made a most terrible mistake and in consequence incurred appalling national disasters. We have to add, however, that the Liberal Christian is equally convinced that when subsequently traditionalist Christianity has rejected that Gospel of the Kingdom of God in its spirit and practice, its sufferings have been no less tragic.

Of the Messiahship of Jesus — His *anointing by the Holy Spirit* which inspired His Mission and Message — the Liberal Christian has no doubt, although he may well doubt whether Jesus made any claim to Messiahship in the Jewish sense of that title. Modern historical criticism of Christian origins, seeking to stand midway between scepticism and superstition, is convinced that although Jesus believed Himself to have a unique knowledge of the Divine Being and of His Will, He was primarily concerned with imparting that Divine knowledge and securing acceptance of it and obedience to it, and not with making Messianic claims for Himself. 'Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things that I say?' is an undoubted saying of His, as is also:

> 'He that heareth these words of mine and doeth them is like a man who built his house upon a rock.'

It is this promulgation of His Gospel which constituted for Jesus His Messianic office.

It is only by the acceptance of the supreme authority and value of the Gospel of the Kingdom of God as proclaimed by Jesus that the gulf between Judaism and Christianity can be breached. There are many indications that this point of view and the need for this policy is gaining ground amongst enlightened Christians and enlightened Jews to-day, and not least among those who are for the most part outside traditionalist Christianity and outside traditionalist Judaism.

Rabbi Mattuck writes of the Messianic hope in Judaism:

'In its best-known form it envisaged the coming of a supernatural person who would deliver the Jews from oppression, restore them to Palestine and win the peoples of the world to the Jewish religion.' (p. 115.)

'It came to be a cardinal belief of orthodox Judaism that at some time in the future a being in the form of a man, who would, however, be more than human, would come to deliver the Jews from oppression, to restore their life in Palestine as it was in ancient times, and to inaugurate an era of peace and goodness for all humanity.' (p. 118.)

'Liberal Judaism, on the other hand, does not believe in the coming of such a person, whether in the past or future. There is no need for him. God can work his deliverances in the way in which he works in human history, by inspiring great teachers who teach nations and humanity how to progress in righteousness, and by raising great leaders who will guide nations and mankind to higher achievements in righteousness. But Liberal Judaism does hold the belief in a Messianic age, basing it on the teachings of the Prophets, who looked forward to a time when there will be lasting peace between nations and when human society will be ordered in full accord with the principle of justice.

'The Messianic idea comes, therefore, to a belief in human progress. Its basis is twofold. In the first place it rests on the belief in God. That is, I think, how the Prophets came to it. This world is very imperfect. . . . It cannot therefore always remain like that; for the rule of God must mean that ultimately the world will be the kind of world that He wants. . . . The Kingdom of God means the rule of God over the whole world.' (p. 119.)

'The second ground for the Messianic hope is to be found in human history.'

'The advancement in the past gives ground for the hope of future advancement.'

'The demand that men should strive to create a better world distinguishes the Jewish religion from some others.'

'In this way we conform to the Kingdom of God and work for its full realization in the life of humanity.' (p. 120.)

This is indeed well said, and the Liberal Christian and the Liberal Jew are in harmony here. But the Liberal Christian must ask: 'Where does Jesus come in? And how does Jesus come in?' The Liberal Jew appears to ignore Him. But human history since His advent does not permit Jesus to be ignored. In his citation of Messianic passages in this section of his book Rabbi Mattuck omits one of supreme importance for the understanding of the Messiahship of Jesus from the Liberal Christian point of view. The passage is found in *Deutero-Isaiah* (lxi, 1), by the recitation of which (according to St. Luke) Jesus described Himself and His Mission in the Synagogue of Nazareth:

'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, for He has anointed me (made me a Messiah) to preach the Good News to the humble-hearted.' (*Lk.* iv, 18.)

Jesus claims here to be Messiah not by anointing with oil as in the case of Jewish kings and high priests, but by the inspiration

of the Divine Spirit; His Mission is not monarchical nor hierarchical but prophetic.

George Adam Smith said on one occasion: 'The mystery and the treasure of the Religion of Israel is its prophetism.' It is emphatically the prophetism of Jesus — the fine flower of the prophetism of Israel—which constitutes the mystery and the treasure of the Christian Religion. It is this prophetic Messiahship of Jesus which alone promises to make the Christian Religion the religion of mankind. It is the weakness of Liberal Judaism, so it seems to us, that it fails to recognize the quality of this Messiahship of Jesus.

In traditional Christianity the Messiahship of Jesus has been too often misunderstood and misrepresented. We cannot deal with these misunderstandings and misrepresentations here, but it is not surprising that, misled by them, the Liberal Jew ignores the essential reality of the Messiahship of Jesus which underlies them.

As the Divinity of Jesus can only be rightly realized by approaching it through and basing it upon the quality of His manhood, so the Messiahship of Jesus can only be rightly realized by approaching it through and basing it upon His Gospel of the Kingdom of God. As we come by faith and obedience to realize the truth of that Gospel, so we come to realize the Messianic personality of Jesus. As without the right understanding of His Humanity there can be no right understanding of His Divinity, so without the right understanding of His Gospel of the Kingdom there can be no right realization of His Messiahship. There is the *crux*.

It was the thin red line of the Messiah's blood which separated the Christian Church from Judaism. The reunion of Jew and Christian cannot be secured simply by the elimination of Jesus, but only by the right understanding of His significance both for Christian and for Jew.

BOOK REVIEWS

MAN'S INFANCY*

It is a matter of common knowledge that the robin is by way of being a territorial magnate; that is to say, he will allow no other member of his species, except his mate, to tresspass on his ground. He will fight to the death with any interloper. It would appear that our primitive ancestors, both pre-human and human, practised a similar territorialism. Each group of anthropoids or humans occupied its own area of forest, jungle, or other habitat; the intrusion of strangers was resented and trespassers were quickly liquidated.

**A New Theory of Human Evolution*, by Sir Arthur Keith. (Watts & Co.; 21/-.)

The groups were thus isolated from one another, and mating took place exclusively within the group; and this isolation, accompanied by inbreeding, was, in the view of Sir Arthur Keith, a primary factor in the evolution of our species. During the whole period of human evolution, he holds, mankind was divided into a vast number of isolated local communities, each inhabiting a delimited area. The habitable earth formed a mosaic of separated territories each exclusively occupied by its own peculiar group.

That group isolation of this sort can be a primary factor in evolutionary change is a corollary of Mendelian theory, according to which the characters of one generation are transmitted to the next by means of discrete living particles known as genes. A primitive human group is the bearer of an assemblage of genes which is cut off from all surrounding assemblages, so that no strange genes can intrude. With repeated matings the genes which circulate within the group enter into new combinations and give rise to individuals in which the old characters are combined in new ways, and there is a tendency for some of the characters to become exaggerated.

Inbreeding, it is generally agreed, reduces variability; but it is not the *amount* of variability which matters so much as its *direction*. So long as the variations are in the same direction progressive changes take place. And as for the alleged evil consequences of inbreeding, everything depends on the quality of the genes assembled in the group pool. If these are all sound and health giving, all will be well, but if dysgenic elements preponderate, the group bearing them will degenerate and disappear. On this theory a human population divided into small, isolated, competitive groups might give quick evolutionary returns.

Indeed Sir Arthur Keith says that he was at one time much exercised in mind how to account for the extensive evolutionary changes which appear to have taken place during the Pleistocene Age, even granting that this epoch lasted for a million years. When the known representative of humanity at its opening is compared with the men who succeeded him towards its close 'we cannot help marvelling at the rate at which evolutionary changes have been effected.' There seems much to be said for the view that the division of population into numerous small and independent groups provides exceptional opportunities for a rapid change in racial characteristics.

A major obstacle to the acceptance of the group theory of human evolution is the view that primitive Man was always on the move, with no long quiescent period when local groups were stationary. But in Sir Arthur's view this belief that earliest Man was a migratory animal is based on the happenings of a later period. Pleistocene Man had not, in fact, the resources to render successful migrations possible.

It is noteworthy that the ethical consequence of this group habit of primitive man was a double code of behaviour involving friendship and co-operation towards those within the group, and of enmity and hostility towards those without it: 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour and hate thine enemy.' Though modern national groups are so much wider, something of the same attitude appears to persist, and in Sir Arthur Keith's view internationalism is not just round the corner.

> 'Is nationalism merely a passing phenomenon? Will nations be ultimately swallowed up in a universal government? I dare not look forward for more than a few centuries; within this limited period I feel confident that nationalism, far from weakening, will grow ever stronger.'

There are so many interesting topics dealt with in this book by an octo-

genarian that it is not possible to advert to all, or to do justice to the width and range of the author's learning. But it is possible to pay tribute to the spirit of scientific disinterestedness in which the book is written.

J.C.H.

CIVILIZATION AND RELIGIOUS VALUES*

The historian Gibbon, living in an enlightened age, held that European civilization was likely to prove permanent because the exterior barbarian had neither the resources nor the techniques for a successful assault upon it. Since the eighteenth century we have learned two things. First, that the exterior barbarian is adept to learn to manufacture and use our weapons of offence. Second, that the exterior barbarian is not the only, and perhaps not the most formidable, menace. The interior barbarian is the man we have to fear.

The interior barbarian is the person who, though *in* a civilization, is not *of* it. Its traditions and values are nothing to him. These traditions and values generally find their embodiment in a religion, and thus it is true to say that a religion is the inner side of a civilization. When this religion is rejected or ignored by a large proportion of citizens, the associated civilization is in a precarious state. Just as a plentiful diet lacking in the appropriate vitamins will fail to preserve health, so material resources and amenities are not of themselves sufficient to keep a civilization alive, for 'Man does not live by bread alone.'

Between modern Western civilization and the traditional religion which was its nurse and pedagogue there does appear to exist a considerable gap. Indeed, that religion is widely regarded as belonging to an historical phase which has been superseded by a strictly scientific culture, and people are neither willing nor able to believe in it. Nor are there any visible signs of that creative genius which could bring a religious renascence into being; what passes for such is more like a resurrection of relics.

Dr. Major holds that there are two things which lead modern educated people to disbelieve in religion and to conclude that mankind can get on well enough without it.

> 'The first is due to the extremely conservative character of religion which causes it to retain myths, legends and traditions which although discredited by modern research, religion refuses to reject. This mixture of error with truth discredits religious claims and like a debased currency, drives a sound currency out of circulation. Hard as it may be for religious leaders, it is absolutely needful in a scientific age that what is not true should be definitely separated from the true and consigned to the lumber room.'

The second reason is that the scientific mind is satisfied with secondary causes and unlike the philosophic mind does not demand final causes to satisfy it. For science, to have discovered the *method* of a process is to have discovered its *cause*. It is not the business of science to do otherwise; but this restrictive practice, however necessary, does leave certain important questions unasked and therefore unanswered. And the uninstructed public is apt to assume, either that these questions are unimportant, or that they are unanswerable. But the truth is that we cannot get away from them, however

* *Civilization and Religious Values* (The Hibbert Lectures delivered in the Universities of Cambridge, Manchester and Bristol), by H. D. A. Major, D.D., F.S.A. (George Allen and Unwin; 1948; 7/6.)

much we wish to. To shirk the labour of seeking the right answers is only to be bamboozled by answers which are specious, shallow and demonstrably false.

Thus these two causes of indifference and scepticism reinforce one another. Religion, instead of answering the questions which science must neglect because they lie beyond its province, insists upon answering the questions which science *can* answer—and answers them wrong.

If Auguste Sabatier was right when he described mankind as 'incurably religious,' we may well conclude that religion can look after itself. But at the same time it is true that a natural instinct can be perverted, thwarted, weakened, starved; and perhaps this is what is happening to the religious instinct to-day in the West. The general atmosphere of an industrial, mechanistic and primarily scientific culture may be largely to blame, but religious institutions, hard though their task is in coping with the general indifference, must bear their share of responsibility.

> 'It is,' writes Dr. Major, 'the failure to recognize the need for the evolution of religion to meet new human needs, a new human outlook, a new cultural, social, political environment which is the cause of it being assumed that atheism and materialism are rampant and triumphant; whereas what is really needed is the elimination of atheism and materialism by a more vital and creative understanding and propagation of religion.'

Of course, a good many human needs remain the same as they have ever been, but it should not be impossible to find better ways of meeting them; and perhaps it is true, as Dr. Major says, that though the world is full of religions, 'there is not one as it is organized to-day, which is able to satisfy the religious needs and demands of the modern world.'

To the question what kind of a religion could meet these needs and demands, Dr. Major gives a reply under six heads. It must be (1) a unifying force; (2) it should be evolving and creative; (3) it must be a scientific religion in the sense of being compatible with scientific truth and method; (4) it should be simple and (5) attractive; and finally (6) it should be practical. It must be admitted that religion has not invariably been a unifying force, though it may be doubted whether the bitter divisions usually associated with religion may not primarily be racial or social in character. The differences between Jew and Arab, Hindu and Mohammedan, Orangeman and Papist are not due wholly to divergences in religious belief. But there is no doubt that what may be called spiritual vested interests do create and perpetuate differences which need not exist, and these should be transcended. As for creativeness, this depends upon the presence of vitality, which is something that cannot be organized into existence. But the probability is that vitality and originality are products of freedom, and for this reason dogmatic zeal should not be overdone. As for a scientific religion, in the sense indicated by Dr. Major, he is certainly right in saying that 'The religion which bases its claims on miracles discredits its claims in a scientifically-minded community.' In any case *a priori* views either way should be abjured; it should just be a question of evidence. As for a religion being simple, the fundamental truths are probably few in number, though whether they are simple to understand is another matter. But what really causes the trouble is the tendency to create artificial complexities, and the human mind also loves to embroider its beliefs, nor is a sense of proportion always present in the mind of the believer. A religion should also be attractive in the sense of being able to attract and hold people; it should not repel by hard and stupid fanaticism or ignorant bigotry and intolerance. Nor, on the other hand, should it just

be cheery, hearty, shallow and cheap, laying itself out to entice the rabble. It should be practical, too, though here again there are pitfalls, and religion may easily slip into being no more than a form of social and humanitarian meliorism. But the principle will always hold good that 'by their fruits ye shall know them.' St. James's definition of practical religion still holds good.

Dr. Major holds that a religion satisfying all these requirements already exists. There is not the slightest doubt, in his opinion, 'that the religion which the modern world needs to adopt and adapt is the Christian Religion.' It may indeed be the case that there are features in traditional Christianity which to the modern mind are incredible and repellent; but modern biblical studies have performed an inestimable service by showing that these features are not essential to the Christian Religion.

> 'It is only by getting back to the essentials of the Religion of Jesus and by uniting on the basis of those essentials that modern civilization can secure the religion which it needs so greatly, and the Christian Church secure that which on the one hand will heal its schisms and on the other hand will enable it to convert mankind to "the truth as it is in Jesus."'

Dr. Major devotes a great part of his third Lecture to the question what was the original and essential religion of Jesus. He admits that 'the difficulties which face the modern student in answering this question are immense,' but he stresses various points which he regards as established. For example, Jesus liberated religion from the artificialities of its legalist and ceremonial burdens, rendering it *natural* and *humane*. With regard to the Kingdom of God,

> 'For Jesus it was a here and now Kingdom to be possessed and enjoyed here and now . . . All the good things predicted by Israel's prophets as coming to pass in the last times had arrived. They were here already to be possessed by those who had the faith to see them, the purity of heart to desire them, the single-minded resolution to make them the supreme thing in their life.'

Dr. Major holds that the Kingdom was 'invisible in its nature, unseen, except by those born from above,' and invisible also in its advance, like growth in the vegetable world or the operation of leaven.

> 'For Jesus, it would seem the coming or advance of the Kingdom of God is not apocalyptic and cataclysmic but a moral and spiritual process operating invisibly but producing visible effects.'

For Jesus, moreover, the Kingdom

> 'is not a monarchical state but a divine family; its head is a father; its subjects are sons; its laws are moral and spiritual principles and relationships; its supreme virtue is love.'

This love

> 'is essentially spiritual, moral and mental. It is love as a motive, not as an emotion, and is directed to the true welfare of the person beloved. . . .
>
> 'This stress by Jesus on love (*agapé*), divine and human, as the supreme virtue of the religion of the Kingdom, and inwardness as essential to its right practice, develops a new ideal of righteousness . . . It is not a righteousness secured by legal obedience to regulations, nor, on the other hand, is it an imputed righteousness . . . It is a righteousness realized by wholehearted loyalty to the moral and spiritual relationships and principles enshrined in the Gospel of the Kingdom.'

One may doubt, perhaps, whether love can become a motive without first having been an emotion. 'Her sins, which are many, are forgiven her, for she loved much,' seems to suggest that Jesus attached moral value to an emotion as such, though it is true that in this case the emotion did display itself in an action—an action, however, which had nothing 'useful' about it, as its critics were quick to point out.

The religion thus outlined is certainly a lay religion, 'without a priestly caste, with no sacrificial system, with no sacred shrines.'

> 'This Religion of the Kingdom is as profound as it is simple, as spiritual as it is natural, as inspiring as it is practical, as universal as it is personal. It unites loyalty with freedom, love with duty, service with leadership, and to all it offers the status of divine sonship and universal brotherhood in the human family of God.'

And yet, as Dr. Major does not fail to point out, it failed—even when preached and practised by Jesus Himself. And may it not be that in offering this religion to the modern world as being acceptable to that world, Dr. Major is proving a trifle too optimistic? He is certainly right in saying he can conceive of no better religion for the religious unification and moral and spiritual progress of mankind. But is the world anxious or willing to receive it, even if, as Dr. Major says, 'it cannot be surpassed as a discipline for the moral and spiritual culture of the human personality'? The world may not desire moral and spiritual culture, especially if these are only to be acquired at the cost of personal discipline.

The practical problem, as Dr. Major states, is how the world is to be won to make this religion its own. He realizes that if the people who count can be won over the rest will follow. The two influential classes are the Scientfic Humanists and the Dogmatic Traditionalists, at present sharply separated.

> 'If they cannot be won to accept the Religion of Jesus enshrined in His Gospel of the Kingdom of God as *basic* for their spiritual and moral life the prospects of the survival of our Western civilization are small indeed.'

Dr. Major holds that the scientific humanists should not in fairness be regarded as enemies of the Christian religion, though they may be hostile to a number of Christian dogmas and practices. He believes that the attitude of their greatest men is profoundly sympathetic. He quotes Sir Richard Gregory and Professor Gilbert Murray in support of this. He takes the view that large concessions to the Humanists could be made by the Traditionalists without detriment to the orthodox foundations of the Christian Religion. Perhaps it is the vexed question of the miraculous which is most at issue. On this Dr. Major writes,

> 'Whether certain alleged happenings recorded in the Gospels are historical or unhistorical, and whether they are to be interpreted as miracles or not, are really academic questions and the final verdict on them, if ever given, must be given by the historians and by the scientists. The religious issue is what is the moral and spiritual value of the miraculous in the Religion of Jesus.'

> 'Could there be any betrayal of orthodox Christian faith,' asks Dr Major, 'if the Traditionalists were to concede to the Scientific Humanists that all those portions of the Traditional Christian Creed which affirm miraculous happenings and irruptive acts of God into the Natural Order are not to be required as articles of faith which must be affirmed by those who would enjoy full communion with the Christian Church?'

If such concessions were made by the one side they should be met by concessions on the other side, and thus there would be better hopes of securing a unified Christian civilization. Might not the Scientific Humanists

> 'be prepared to make the Religion of Jesus as enshrined in the spiritual and moral relationships and principles of His Gospel of the Kingdom of God the working hypotheses of their own spiritual life?'

To agree to differ about non-essentials is the best way to secure unity, but the difficulty is to get agreement as to what are the non-essentials. Actually, at present, there seems to be a hardening of opinion on the side of the Traditionalists, and the attitude of the younger generation of scientists and technicians may not be so conciliatory as that of Sir Richard Gregory. But be that as it may, Dr. Major has outlined a clear and courageous policy which, if it were honestly carried out, would undoubtedly effect a miraculous change in the present religious prospect. The trouble is that the advance of secularism serves the purpose of powerful interests which realize that the weakening of religion, or its perversion, serves to magnify State power. These gentlemen propose to ride on Leviathan's back and make slaves of us all.

J.C.H.

ANOTHER LIFE OF JESUS*

'As for Jesus, we know Him very well.' This assertion by Weinel constitutes the key-note of Dr. Cadoux's book. The conviction that Jesus was a real historical person, fully human as well as fully divine, *deitas sub specie humanitatis,* is expressed with freshness and sincerity by Dr. C. J. Cadoux in his recent *Life of Jesus*. Moreover, this conviction is not based upon certain religious pre-suppositions but upon a sound and scholarly scrutiny of the N.T. *data*. The principles of the historical method are upheld throughout.

> 'I am convinced that a simple application of the normal standards of Judgments with which historical and scientific study has made us familiar will enable us to arrive at a fair amount of accurate narrative.' (p. 10).

Thus in form and content the book is loyal to the spirit of science. The fundamental importance therefore of distinguishing between *fact* and *interpretation* is clearly and constantly recognized.

> 'That the facts are unascertainable, or that they are totally indistinguishable from the beliefs held in the Church, I roundly deny — and I deny it on historical grounds which any investigator can test for himself.' (p. 211).

But if Dr. Cadoux is loyal to the spirit of science, he is also loyal to the Spirit of the religion of Jesus. The belief that the servant-poems in *Deutero-Isaiah* provide the key to the understanding of the messianic consciousness of Jesus and that they give meaning and significance to His death upon the Cross, is not original. Dr. Hort over half a century ago stated that,

> 'Suffering is proportional to life. Those who have most life suffer most, as they have also most power to resist suffering,'

and that,

> 'Perfect love, the surest characteristic of perfect life, was wrought and shown in the sacrifice of the Cross.'

* *The Life of Jesus,* by C. J. Cadoux. (Pelican Books, 1948; 1/6.)

But the vicarious suffering of Jesus has often been misinterpreted and misrepresented since. Dr. Cadoux's rational reaffirmation of the incalculable value of the vicarious suffering of Jesus for human, moral and spiritual progress is therefore timely and salutary and constitutes his book's most important and distinctive contribution.

Without doubt many of Dr. Cadoux's convictions are questionable as he himself admits:

> 'My statements are probable rather than certain. I have no doubt that much in my reconstruction and interpretation of the story will call forth the dissent of many — many who are quite well informed as to the nature and contents of the sources.' (p. 19).

Perhaps the least effective and convincing of Dr. Cadoux's conclusions, at least in the light of Dr. Glasson's masterly book on the Advent Hope, are those which have to do with his treatment of the teaching of Jesus about the Last Things. It is possible that his thinking in this respect is influenced by the conviction that Jesus, in His mission and message, retained the Divine *dies irae* of John the Baptist.

> 'The prediction of the wrath to come, when the Messiah would destroy the chaff with unquenchable fire, had been a part of John the Baptist's message; and although the Messiah himself expected at first no cross, there was enough opposition and difficulty in his task, and in the lot of the 'servant' in 'Isaiah' to cause him to retain that part of John's proclamation.' (p. 87).

That Jesus believed in the Last Judgment and that it would be inaugurated with His own generation, Dr. Cadoux has no doubt whatever.

> 'Efforts, of course, are from time to time made to show that Jesus probably (or certainly) did not fortell a visible Second Coming ushering in the Last Judgment; but after repeated study of the data I find myself unable to regard those efforts as successful.' (p. 219).

On points such as this the book will evoke controversy and disagreement. But it will command respect from N.T. scholars as well as from the ordinary reader. And it is for the latter that it is primarily written. All who seek a clear, succinct, analytical and intelligible account of the life of Jesus should read this book.

R. W. Smith

ST. LUKE'S EIRENICON*

Dr. Wilfred Knox, who is pre-eminent in his knowledge of the background and inter-relations of the Jewish, Christian and Pagan religions from the Conversion of St. Paul to the death of Marcion, has given us in his *Acts of the Apostles* a small volume of great value. It contains five Lectures delivered in Oxford in 1946. No student of the New Testament will feel he can afford to neglect it.

Like Dr. Selwyn's *First Epistle of Peter,* Dr. Wilfred Knox's book registers a sound reaction from the extreme conclusions of 19th century, German New Testament criticism. The Tübingen School, whose founder was F. C. Baur, attacked the historicity of the *Acts of the Apostles* on the ground that it was a piece of unhistorical Apology intended to heal the breach created in the Primitive Church by the opposing factions of Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians.

* *The Acts of the Apostles,* by Wilfred L. Knox, D.D. (C.U.P., 1948; 8/6.)

The Tübingen School was right in its classification of *Acts* as an Eirenicon but it was wrong in affirming that the account it gave of primitive church history was fictitious. As an Eirenicon, *Acts* was succesful and proved of great value in helping to create the Catholic Church which, under the leadership of the Ignatian Monarchical Episcopate, welded together the numerous isolated local churches into one great self-conscious Christian community.

F. C. Baur's criticism of *Acts* in the 19th century proved to be as influentially disconcerting in the field of New Testament scholarship as Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* became in the early decades of the 20th century.

The Tübingen hydra, after much fighting has been slain. Its most formidable opponents were Sir Wm. Ramsey's *St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen* and Harnack's *Lukas der Artz* (E. T. Crown Theological Library) and Kirsopp Lake's and Foakes Jackson's *The Beginnings of Christianity* (5 volumes).

It has been left to Dr. Wilfred Knox in his succinct volume to administer the *coup de grace*.

In his first lecture dealing with the authorship of *Acts*, Dr. Knox concludes that *Acts* was compiled by a fellow-traveller of St. Paul 'who also wrote the Gospel according to St. Luke.'

The most valuable contribution in this lecture is Dr. Knox's convincing confutation of the philological arguments adduced by Professor A. C. Clark in his *Acts of the Apostles*, 1933. Dr. Knox sums up as follows:

> 'The result is that Clark's linguistic researches, whatever their value in drawing attention to the unevenness of the reviser's methods may be, tend to prove that the same hand is responsible for the final compilation both of the Acts and the Gospel. It is only reasonable to suppose that it is the same hand that has added the two prefaces and the incidental pieces of "scholarship prose" and that it is the hand of the writer of the "we-sections." There seems no reason to doubt that it is the hand of Luke "the beloved physician".' (p. 14f.)

In his second lecture on 'The Sources of *Acts*,' Dr. Knox concludes that for the most part St. Luke did not use written sources but that he 'collected his material from oral tradition, often taking down his informant's words *verbatim*.' (p. 39).

In his concluding lecture on 'The Theology of *Acts*,' Dr. Knox recognizes clearly, as did Dr. Lock many years ago in his valuable Essay on the Christology of the early chapters of *Acts*, what has been called St. Peter's 'Adoptionist Christology' and points out:

> 'It is not until the conversion of Paul that we get anything which corresponds to the later and more developed Christology of the Pauline Epistles.' (p. 77).
>
> 'We have then considerable justification for believing that Luke has left us an accurate picture of the theology of the early Church in Palestine and not simply read back into it the developed system of the Pauline period.' (p. 80).

Lack of space forbids any attempt to deal further with this thought-provoking volume. It abounds with *obiter dicta* and arresting items of out-of-the-way knowledge, such as only a great scholar can produce from his treasures. The sense of humour often evinced in the turn of a phrase delights, but does not surprise the reader of a theological treatise by a brother of the Editor of *Punch*.

H.D.A.M.

A MODERNIST SAINT*

Dr. Seaver to whom we owe so much for his life of Schweitzer has just produced *The Faith of Edward Wilson* — a small volume but great in value.

Dr. Edward Wilson was the colleague and friend of Scott of the Antarctic and died in the same tent with him in the blizzard which overtook the explorers on their return journey from the South Pole within eleven miles of their home base.

Dr. Seaver has already produced two books on Edward Wilson *Edward Wilson of the Antarctic* and *Edward Wilson: Nature Lover.* This third book deals with the religious life of Edward Wilson and is of intense interest to the student of religious experience for Edward Wilson was indeed a saint: not a primitive saint nor a mediaeval saint but a modern saint. The son of a much beloved Cheltenham physician he followed in his father's footsteps and received his medical training in St. George's Hospital, London. He accompanied Scott as doctor and zoologist on his first Antarctic expedition in 1901. This lasted four years and 'was a triumph of scientific discovery.' After that Wilson spent six years on scientific research in Scotland and at the same time he illustrated with exquisite artistic skill various standard works on British birds and mammals.

In 1910 he once again accompanied Scott to the South Pole — this time as Chief of the Scientific Staff. But he was much more than a scientist. He was, to use Dr. Seaver's phrase, 'the soul' of the expedition. His physical courage and endurance were outstanding but combined with intense sympathy and self-forgetful helpfulness shown towards those who needed it. His personal supremacy he owed to the quality of his religion but that religion was never obvious. It came as a great surprise to some of his closest companions who survived him to learn from the diaries and letters published after his death how profoundly religious he was.

> '"For Wilson" as Dr. H. S. Pennington said of him "religion was a divine life, not a divine science".' (p. 5).

Nevertheless the mental make-up of Edward Wilson was essentially that of a modern scientist.

> 'The works of Darwin were for him almost a second Bible.' He wrote: 'All my religious beliefs are founded on the idea of evolution driven to its logical conclusion.' (p. 6).

Yet at the same time Edward Wilson's religion was essentially Christian inspired pre-eminently by the Christ of the Gospels. Though no Higher Critic, Wilson studied the Gospels with the insight of a modern man of science. The pre-scientific character of many of the Gospel narratives gave him no trouble. He recognized this pre-scientific element for what it was and had no difficulty in separating from it the spiritual and moral elements in the Gospel. He had no need of the warning uttered by a seventeenth century English theologian:

> 'If a man will not feed on the good meat of the Word, let him not be surprised if he be choked with its dry bones.'

This power of moral and spiritual discernment is well illustrated by his verdict on a book of liturgical devotion about which he had been questioned.

> 'It is all abstruse argument and old Church History, and I can't make out what he means very often, and when I do it goes entirely against the

* *The Faith of Edward Wilson of the Antarctic,* by George Seaver. (John Murray, 1948; 3/6.)

grain . . . In this book I get an insight into the endless mischief and contention that has arisen through attempts to understand what for me has always been a mystery . . .

'I cannot help thinking that people who talk of the "Real Presence" and the "Objective Presence"—who say that when the elements are consecrated Christ is present, or His flesh and blood are actually present, in a way in which neither He nor they were present before—must be saying things which they conceive to be mysteries, but which are entirely different from the plain meaning of the words they use . . .

'That is the secret after all, to get to know and love Christ through love for *all* His brothers and sisters, and not to expect to get to know Christ first and then begin to think of them . . .' (p. 35).

His religion was essentially sincere, simple, practical. He summed it up thus:

'God is Love, and His Spirit is the power to love and attract love. This changes one's whole outlook on life, and then we have a glimpse of heaven . . .' (p. 36).

'Love comes to me by one channel only—the recognition of some beauty, whether mental, moral, or physical; colour or form or sound; so long as it represents to me a type, however lowly, of my conception of what is perfect—*there* is beauty.'

His religious faith—Christian and scientific Dr. Seaver formulates as follows:

'He discerned an immanent purpose ceaselessly at work, informed by an imaginative energy continually expanding and releasing itself for the realization of its own inherent ideals, exfoliating into ever finer forms of beauty and wonder; till the crown of creation came with man, a being with free-will and infinite possibilities, endless capacities, conscious of his freedom and of his responsibilities, into whom God breathed the breath of Life after the Spirit, . . .'

'The divinity of Christ was fundamental to his faith. Yet Christ was for him no ready-made perfection, no *deus ex machina,* but a man like others who, though He were a Son, was made perfect through the discipline of suffering; not the Great Exception, but the Great Example; . . .'

The four following affirmations of his religious experience constitute the foundations of his faith.

'Remove the power of life which we call God, and nothing remains.' (p. 37).

'I had spent some weeks or months without saying any prayers because I had come to consider them a useless waste of time. But everything else seemed to be becoming also a useless waste of time, excepting always the seeing beauty in nature and the attempt to fix something on paper.' (p. 16).

'Religion is not a test to judge by, but an immense aid for those who use it to live by.' (p. 19).

'This is the most fascinating ideal I think I ever imagined, to become entirely careless of your own soul and body in looking after the welfare of others.' (p. 20).

H.D.A.M.

SCHWEITZER'S PHILOSOPHY CHALLENGED*

The Challenge of Schweitzer by Mr. Middleton Murry is an attempt to come to grips with the thought of a most remarkable man.

> 'In thought Schweitzer explicitly renounces all claim to give any valid interpretation of the world and history, and puts forward a new and astonishing claim to demonstrate that the ethical doctrine of *reverence for life* is a "necessity of thought." No equally revolutionary paradox has ever been put forward in the history of Western thought. If it can be maintained, it would not merely annihilate historical Christianity, but it would also annihilate the whole tradition of Western thought, which is that in the last resort, the universe is rational and that history has a meaning.' (p. 7).

In his writings Schweitzer repeats with almost wearisome reiteration that history has no meaning — 'historical knowledge cannot call spiritual life into existence,' yet he commends his absolute ethic of *reverence for life* by the assertion that there is an historical development by which the circle of ethics grows wider and ethics becomes more profound. Primitive man has duties only towards his nearest relations. The tribe grows wider into the nation until at last man realizes his ethical obligations to the whole of humanity. This represents an enormous act of thinking.

From this historical development Schweitzer concludes that his own ethic is the most comprehensive.

The paradox is notable. Mr. Murry remarks 'if this is not invoking historical knowledge to call spiritual life into existence I do not know what is.'

Moreover the whole of Schweitzer's treatise on Civilization and Ethics is an example of this fundamental paradox.

He expounds the history of ethical theory to the conclusion that there is no meaning in history, yet he claims that this history is consummated in his own ethical discovery.

Mr. Murry remarks that Schweitzer's absolute ethic which is unconcerned with history is akin to Barth's transcendent God who is equally unconcerned with history.

Schweitzer claims that his absolute ethic of *reverence for life* is the ethic of Jesus brought to philosophic expression, extended to cosmic form and conceived as intellectually necessary.

This recalls the last chapter of *'The Quest of the Historical Jesus'* in which Schweitzer avers that the consciousness of Jesus was wholly eschatological — *totaliter aliter*. This extreme view has not been found acceptable to many distinguished scholars and Streeter's demonstration of a progressive development in the eschatological element from the Synoptic sources *Q* to *Mk.* to *M.* still remains unshaken.

Because Schweitzer conceives of the Kingdom as wholly eschatological destined to come on earth by cosmic catastrophe he will have nothing to do with the Kingdom realizable here and now by human co-operation with the Divine Will. In his thought *reverence for life* takes the place of the mystery of the Kingdom of God.

Mr. Murry shows that this is an unequal exchange and compared to the warmth and riches of the Kingdom, *reverence for life* seems singularly lacking in persuasive power — notwithstanding its passionate promulgation by Schweitzer.

But why was not Schweitzer content with Our Lord's teaching? Attentive

* *The Challenge of Schweitzer*, by J. Middleton Murry. (Jason Press, London, 1948; 6/-.)

readers of Schweitzer's works will have noted that in some mysterious way the idea of the Fatherhood of God is radically alien to him.

It is the Christ-Mysticism of St. Paul that Schweitzer finds more akin to his thought. Remarking on the high excellency of Schweitzer's book *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* Mr. Murry adds . . .

> 'Schweitzer understands Paul as it were from within. But his book on Jesus makes a very different impression, as the work of one determined or destined to dissolve the real human personality of Jesus away. The reason for this is plain. At the very heart of the doctrine of Jesus lies the personal experience of God as a loving Father . . . But to Schweitzer the experience of the Fatherhood of God is almost incomprehensible, since, translated into modern terms, it involves all those insights that Schweitzer repudiates as impossible.' . . . (p. 85).
>
> 'Schweitzer's uniqueness as a Christian thinker is that he both contemplates Jesus and avoids him, seeks him and nullifies him.' (p. 119).

One of the most valuable chapters in this book is the comparison of the thought-processes of Schweitzer and Keats.

Mr. Murry combines the strongest disapproval of Schweitzer as a thinker with unqualified admiration for him as a Christian hero. After quoting at length the well-known passage from *'On the Edge of the Primeval Forest'* in which Schweitzer describes an operation he had performed on a native, Mr. Murry adds . . .

> 'There is no answer to that. There in indefeasable human experience is the meaning of Schweitzer's rejection of the Fatherhood of God and the meaning of his 'being in Christ.' No living man can deny that these two attitudes, contradictory in theology, irreconcileable in speculation, are reconciled in the human activity of this hero of our time, are given together in his living, labouring life. If Christ is anywhere in the world to-day, He is in Schweitzer at Lamberéné and Schweitzer in Him.' . . . (p. 129).
>
> 'Would that the known and personal Jesus shone as manifest in my works as the unknowable and impersonal Jesus shines in his.' (p. 133).

This book is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Schweitzer. It is acute, concise, lucid.

L.W.B.

MODERN JEWISH CHASSIDISM

Mamre * is the enigmatic title of a collection of essays by the Professor of Sociology at the University of Jerusalem. Most of them were written some time ago, but they are now translated into English for the first time. They are not for the most part easy reading; the author's thought forms are often obscure and their obscurity is naturally increased in translation. Nevertheless Prof. Buber's deep religious insight is luminously clear. Judaism, he admits, has for its outer covering a hard protective shell, but in these essays that covering is continually being lifted and we are allowed a series of glimpses at the spiritual kernel within.

He shows it to consist in the sense of intimate relationship between the individual soul and God:

> 'The whole history of the world, the hidden, real world history, is a

* *Mamre, Essays in Religion*, by Martin Buber, translated by Greta Hort. (Melbourne University Press; London: O.U.P., 1946; 12/6.)

dialogue between God and his creature; a dialogue in which man is a true, legitimate partner, who is entitled and empowered to speak his own independent word from out of his own being.' (p. 4).

Thus it is no passive part that man is called upon to play. He is not as clay in the hands of the potter, but made by God in His own image, destined to become His son.

'The pious Jews of pre-Christian time called upon their God as their "Father"; and when the naïvely pious Jew in Eastern Europe to-day uses this name, he does not repeat something that he has learnt, but he bears witness to a realization which has grown up in himself of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man . . . In spite of the complete distance between God and man they know that when God created man, he set the mark of his image upon his brow and embedded it in his nature, and that however faint it may become, it can never be wiped out.' (p. 21).

Judaism, the writer claims:

'which more than any other religion has grasped the seriousness for actual life of the fact that God created man, has also most unequivocably recognized the importance for the life of man made 'in his image.' To this the word of Rabbi Akiba bears witness, . . . "Beloved is man, for he was created in the image of God; but it was by a special love that it was *made known* to him that he was created in the image of God." That it has been revealed to us that we are made in his image gives the incentive to unfold this image, and in doing so to imitate God.' (pp. 39-40).

How far Prof. Buber is representative of Jewish religious thought to-day, it would perhaps be rash to guess. His sympathies lie chiefly with Chassidism —a pietist movement, somewhat akin to Quakerism, which arose among the Jews of Eastern Europe about the middle of the eighteenth century, and the latter part of the book is devoted to its interpretation. In Chassidism however he sees:

'only a movement of concentration. It is the concretion of all those elements which are to be found in a suspended form everywhere in Judaism at all times, also in Rabbinic Judaism. Only in Rabbinic Judaism it is not found in the visible structure of a community, but holds its sway in the hidden structure of the personal life.' (pp. 1-2).

'The centre of Chassidic teaching is 'no secret formulae, but the hallowing of everything.' (p. 86).

'Only the indiscriminate consecration of all acts, only the turning of the normal life towards God as it happens from day to day, only the hallowing of the natural union with the world, have the redeeming power. The everyday of redemption grows only out of the redemption of every day.' (p. 116).

In spite of the strong emphasis which it lays upon the personal relationship between God and man, it would be a mistake to suppose that the outlook of Chassidism is purely individual.

'"When a man sees that his neighbour hates him," said Sabbi Rafael of Berschad, "then he must love him more than he did before to fill up what is lacking" . . . Rabbi Rafael used always to warn against applying the measuring rod in one's dealings with people: A surplus of love is necessary to fill up what is lacking of love in this world.' (p. 92).

In a deeply thoughtful essay on Chassidism and Spinoza, Prof. Buber points to the danger of unworldliness in religion growing into sheer unreality.

'The real communion of man with God,' he says, 'has not only its place in the world, but also its object. God speaks to man in the things and beings whom he sends him in life. Man answers through his dealings with these things and beings. All specific 'divine service' is in itself only the renewed preparation for and hallowing of this communion with God in the world. But it is the ancient danger, perhaps it is the most extreme danger and temptation of man that something comes to be taken away and isolated from the human side . . . It may be the forms by which man hallows the world for God that become independent, what we may call the 'cult-sacramental' forms; then they cease to embody the consecration of the lived, every day life, and become instead the means of its separation from God . . . Or it may be . . . that the soul wants to deal only with God; it is as if she desired to exercize her love for him on him alone and not on his world . . . But with the world God himself has disappeared, and only she alone, the soul is left.' (p. 103f).

By his protest against this, Spinoza showed 'the very same instinct which once made the prophets protest against the independent sacrificial cult.' (p. 105).

'But Spinoza's attack goes beyond its legitimate object; not only does the communion with God held apart from the world become unbelievable to him, but personal communion with God becomes also unbelievable.' (p. 105).

It is in Chassidism, the Professor claims, that the true answer is to be found.

'It is only the fact that the God who transcends the world is yet also immanent in it which can turn the world into a sacrament . . . but . . . it is only when it is brought into actual contact with the individual that the world becomes sacramental . . . Man's existence in the world becomes fraught with meaning, because the things and beings of the world have been given to him in their sacramental potentiality . . . The chassidic world is the concrete world as it is in this moment of a person's life; it is a world ready to be a sacrament, ready to carry a real act of redemption.' (pp. 105-6).

The profound accordance of Prof. Buber's expositions with Christian teaching must be apparent. But as he reads this book, even when he is in closest agreement with it, the Christian will inevitably feel that something is lacking from its faith which his own possesses. It is of course belief in the Incarnation. All that is written here of the Fatherhood of God, of the sacramental nature of the world, is from the Christian standpoint undoubtedly true. But Prof. Buber is able to affirm these truths only because as he says, 'That God has never been doubted by the soul of Jacob.' Besides this all that he has recourse to is paradox and an almost Barthian distrust of reason. It must indeed be admitted that misunderstanding of the Incarnation has sometimes been a source of darkness rather than of light; that the Jew perchance has remembered that man is made in God's image when the Christian has forgotten it, but in no boastful spirit it may fairly be claimed that an Incarnational philosophy, the implications of which are fully recognized, gives to the beliefs which essentially are held by Christian and Jew in common, a vast enrichment and clarification.

It would in any case be well for that common ground to be shared more readily. We could wish heartily that the prophetic strain in the succession to which Prof. Buber surely stands were more in evidence amongst the Jews to-day. Probably the Professor would not call himself a liberal Jew, but the

following characteristic passage will indicate his true liberality and the possibility of sympathetic understanding:

> 'Until the Messiah comes, our destinies divide us. Until then the Jew is to the Christian the incomprehensibly obdurate man, who will not see what has happened; and the Christian is to the Jew the reckless man, who in an unredeemed world affirms that its redemption is accomplished. This is a gulf which no human power can bridge. But it does not prevent the common watch for a unity coming from God to us, which, soaring above all your comprehension and our comprehension, affirms and denies, denies and affirms, what you hold and what we hold, and which substitutes for the credal truths of earth, the ontological truth of heaven: Which is one.' (p. 31).

This particular essay was read as a paper to a Conference of Missions to the Jews!

D. L. Scott

THE QUEST OF THE SPIRITUAL CHRIST*

Professor D. M. Baillie of St. Andrew's University, brother of Dr. John Baillie, the brilliant Gifford Lecturer, has produced an erudite and able volume, *God was in Christ,* in defence of the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation, Trinity and Atonement. The main theme of his book is the Incarnation: the Atonement and Trinity are subsidiary.

Dr. Baillie's treatment of his theme is modern both in manner and matter: in his conclusions he is strictly orthodox. Dr. Baillie is a master of technical theology and it is gratifying to read one who never errs in his use of technical terms or is guilty of such popular errors as the identification of a theological Person with a psychological Personality or would maintain that the pre-existence of the Second Person of the Trinity authorizes belief in the pre-existence of the human Personality of Jesus.

This book pre-supposes that its reader has a good general knowledge of the development of Christian theology and so of course of the main issues involved in the great heretical controversies. Dr. Baillie refers to those dogmatic crises but does not discuss them minutely, save where in certain cases the point in which he is engaged in making, demands it: for instance the tritheistic tendencies in the Trinitarian expositions of the three Cappadocian theologians.

For the modern student the most valuable portion of Dr. Baillie's volume is his survey of Christological development and criticism in the 19th century. This survey may be said to begin with Schweitzer's epoch-making volume *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* published in 1902, and to conclude with Professor Hodgson's *The Doctrine of the Trinity*. This section contains Dr. Baillie's summaries and appreciations of the Christological contributions of Karl Barth, Emil Brunner, Karl Heim, R. H. Grützmacher, Reinhold Niebuhr, R. Bultmann, Hoskyns and Davey, Fr. L. S. Thornton, C. H. Dodd, C. C. J. Webb, R. H. Lightfoot, etc.

It is hard to discover what part modern criticism of the Gospels plays as a factor in Dr Baillie's theological conclusions. Where Dr. Baillie stands in reference to the controversies about the historicity of the Virgin birth, the physical Resurrection and Ascension and Johannine miracles is not divulged.

Dr. Baillie beholds our modern Christology standing at the Cross Roads and describes the situation as follows:

* *God was in Christ*: an Essay on Incarnation and Atonement, by D. M. Baillie, D.D. (Faber & Faber, 1948; 16/-.)

'Thus if Christology to-day stands at the parting of the ways, the fork is not double but triple. And if we refuse to be led down either of the side roads, because each of them represents a false simplification of the problem, we shall then have to re-think the old problems of the Person and work of Christ as they present themselves to theology in this twentieth century.' (p. 29.)

It is this re-thinking that Dr. Baillie attempts. He cannot feel satisfied with Ritschlian Christology with its symbolism and value judgment, nor on the other hand can he feel satisfied with the 'back to the Jesus of History' Christology. He contends for the union of Gospel history with Catholic theology such as the *Definition of Faith of the Council of Chalcedon* undertook to provide.

Dr. Baillie takes his stand on the full humanity of Jesus with all its human limitations. In it neither divine omnipotence, divine ominiscience, divine omnipresence have any place. This absolute humanity of Jesus is an essential factor in Dr. Baillie's Christology.

Dr. Baillie's supreme interest is the union of the Two Natures in the Person of Jesus Christ. How are we to understand the hypostatic union of the Godhead and the Manhood in Him? The keynote of Dr. Baillie's solution is summed up in the phrase the 'paradox of grace.' This is a valuable and original contribution to Christology and is best summarized in Dr. Baillie's own words.

'The God in whom Christians believe is, as we have seen, not merely the Creator, the Lawgiver, the wise and righteous Moral Governor, but something far more wonderful: he is the One who *gives* us what He demands of us, *provides* the obedience that He requires; so that we are constrained to acknowledge what I have called the paradox of grace, expressed in the confession: "I . . . yet not I, but the grace of God." This is a paradox because the ascription of all the glory to God for anything good that is in us does not imply any destruction of our freedom as human personalities, but precisely the reverse: our actions are never more truly free and personal and human, they are never more truly our own, than when they are wrought in us by God. But the whole experience of this paradox, which covers only those fragments of our lives in which there is something good, has come into our lives through One in whom it covered the whole of His life, so that His life was the very life of God Himself, and yet was at the same time in the fullest sense the life of a man. Jesus Christ is the One in whom human self-hood fully came to its own and lived its fullest life, as human life ought to be lived, because His human self-hood was wholly yielded to God, so that His whole life was the life of God. That was the one life which was wholly divine and wholly human. He lived His life in such a way that it was the life of God incarnate; but also, since the initiative is always with God, He lived it as He did *because* it was the life of God incarnate. And thus through Him there came to those who knew Him a new revelation of God.

But what happened through Him did not come to an end when "the days of His flesh" ended, though His disciples thought it would and were appalled at the prospect of His being taken from them. Very soon afterwards they made two great discoveries. They discovered, first, that the divine Presence of which they had become aware while their Master was with them in the flesh had come back to them, . . . And their second discovery was that this experience, which depended entirely on

Jesus, need not be confined to those who had known Jesus in the flesh. It could come to anybody anywhere through the story of Jesus and their witness to its meaning.' (p. 144f.)

H.D.A.M.

LEGALISM AND RELIGION

Dr. Daube's *Studies in Biblical Law** has a unique value. In it the author, who possesses a profound and extensive knowledge of the origins and development of ancient legal systems — Roman, Teutonic, Semitic — treats a number of incidents in the Old Testament narratives which lend themselves to legal interpretation in the light of his own studies of ancient law.

Underlying his arresting interest in the correct legal interpretation of the significance of various hitherto unnoticed details in the cases which he selects for investigation is the author's purpose of demonstrating that the origin of law whether Jewish or non-Jewish is non-religious, or at any rate pre-religious. Laws existed in Israel long before the Biblical writers ascribed the origin of the Old Testament legal codes to the God of Israel.

Legal systems have many origins—domestic, economic, religious, political. They put into legal form customs which aim at defining and regulating rites and duties in all these spheres. Behind these customs stand primitive taboos mostly of a negative character. They go back to a stage of human culture in which there is no clear distinction between religion and ethics. The medicine man and the magician, the priest and the chieftain, have interchangeable functions. 'Is Saul also among the prophets?'

Legal codes appear late in the history of human culture and when their origin is ascribed to God it is with the object of giving them the very highest kind of authority. This was why the various codes of the Jewish *Torah* were stated to have been given by Yahweh to Moses, who delivered them to Israel.

The code of Hummurabi, about 2100 B.C. (very much older than any of Israel's legal codes) claimed a similar Divine origin. The monolith on which the code is inscribed is headed by a carving showing the great King Hammurabi standing in the presence of the seated sun-god Shamash, who is represented as delivering the legal code to the king.

Dr. Daube, by race a Jew, possessed of a knowledge of Hebrew and minutely acquainted with the text of his nation's Scriptures, brings to light many interesting points in his Biblical exegesis. Christian students will find his treatment of redemption and the duties and functions of the *goel* (redeemer or avenger) of the greatest interest.

In this volume Dr. Daube's legal knowledge and literary culture are outstandingly manifest, but his knowledge of Comparative Religion and of the Higher Criticism of the Old Testament is conspicuous by its absence.

It is something of a curiosity to have a Cambridge don writing a volume dealing with ancient Israelite law and Semitic religion without any reference to William Robertson Smith, Sir James Frazer and Professor Kennett. Perhaps our author's reticence is due to rigorous exclusion in order to provide space for his own unique contribution. We observe, however, that in his Preface Dr. Daube does express his thanks to Dr. Stanley Cook and Professor Marsh.

It is interesting to compare this volume with Dr. Charles' Warburton Lectures on the Decalogue delivered to lawyers by a profound scholar with a different background.

H.D.A.M.

* *Studies in Biblical Law*, by David Daube. (C.U.P., 1947; 21/-.)

ORIGINS OF THE JEWISH CALENDAR*

Religious Calendars are very old. Indeed they are the oldest of all calendars and go back at least 5,000 years. They would seem to have had two main sources of origin : (1) astronomical or astrological—the moon in this respect being more influential than the sun ; (2) pastoral and agricultural seasons. The religious calendars which commemorate historical events as deserving religious celebration belong to a later stage.

When St. Paul, in the name of his Master, liberated the Christian Religion from Judaism, he abolished the Jewish religious calendar. To his erring converts who were tempted to relapse into Jewish legalism he writes :

> 'Ye observe, days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.' (*Gal.* iv, 10 f.)

The only sacred day authorized for observance in the Pauline churches was the first day of the week (the Lord's day). But religion is the most conservative thing in the world, and so the new religion of Christ began to create for itself its own religious calendar which in time surpassed in variety and intricacy the religious calendar of Judaism from which it had been liberated.

How ancient that Jewish calendar is : how various the changes through which it passed : how different the sources from which its sacred occasions were derived : how intimately they reflect the beliefs and practices of Israel's religion in its triple stage of development is related with clarity and erudition by the Rev. Norman Snaith in his latest book, *The Jewish New Year Festival.*

Mr. Snaith's book, which constitutes a valuable contribution to the library of Comparative Religion, is not solely descriptive and historical but is also refreshingly controversial. Mr. Snaith is no pan-Babylonian on the one hand, nor on the other hand is he a servile adherent of the Tylor-Frazer School of religious anthropologists. He has his own convictions and conclusions and states them vigorously. The thesis of this book is thus summarized by its publishers :

> 'The importance of this study lies in the fact that some scholars allege that there was in ancient Jewry a Festival in which Jehovah was enthroned as king annually with all ceremonial according to a myth-ritual pattern common to the whole of the Near East. The King-motif of this festival has been adduced as evidence. The book seeks to show that this evidence is inadmissible.
>
> 'The book includes a study of the development of the Calendar amongst the Jews from the earliest times, and there is a new suggestion about the origin of the Sabbath with its strict taboos.'

Mr. Snaith's book demands the attention of all modern students of Old Testament Religion who are interested in its ceremonial development. When a well-known Dean was asked whether he was interested in liturgiology he replied, 'No : nor do I collect postage stamps.' Nevertheless Jewish and Christian liturgical practices enshrine the religious beliefs and values of the institutionalists who created them. V.M.B.

* *The Jewish New Year Festival,* by Norman H. Snaith, M.A. (S.P.C.K., 1948; 13/6.)

THE GITA ACCORDING TO RADHAKRISHNAN

If the true greatness of a sacred scripture may be judged by the extent to which it has been known and loved by mankind, the *Bhagavadgita** must be reckoned as one of the greatest of human writings. Among the Hindus, who number some 250 millions of souls, it is generally given the supreme place

* The *Bhagavadgita* by Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan. (Allen & Unwin, 1948; 10/6.)

of honour in their Scriptures. Hindu scholars, ancient and modern from Sankara and Ramanuja in the 8th and 11th centuries to Vidyasagar, B. G. Tilak and Aurobindo Ghose in modern times, have explored its message with devoted care; and Mahatma Ghandi has testified:

> 'I find a solace in the *Bhagavadgita* that I miss even in the Sermon on the Mount. When disappointment stares me in the face, and I see not one ray of light, I go back to the *Bhagavadgita,* and I immediately begin to smile.' (*Young India,* pp.1078f.)

Among non-Hindus, too, the interest, and even devotion, that it has evoked has been without parallel. Ever since the East India Company, 163 years ago, published Sir Charles Wilkins' translation of the *Gita,* a succession of European scholars have brought out translations and commentaries, not only in English, but in French (1787), German (1833, &c.), modern Greek (1848), and Polish (1922). Even to-day, the interest shows no sign of flagging, for within the last five years, at least five new editions by English writers have appeared. Aldous Huxley, in 1945, wrote: 'The *Bhagavadgita* is perhaps the most systematic spiritual statement of the Perennial Philosophy.'

In view of all this, the question may be asked, Is there need for yet another commentary? In any case, however, whatever comes from the pen of Sir Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan is always full of charm and interest, and whatever he deals with he illuminates; even though it may be that sometimes the light shines more clearly on the views of the commentator than on the object of his comment.

The *Bhagavadgita* ('The Lord's Song') is, it will be remembered, imbedded in the great Epic Poem, the *Mahabharata,* somewhat as the Song of Moses is imbedded in our Pentateuch. In form, it is a duologue between the warrior Arjuna and the God Krishna, and its central message is the answer of Krishna to Arjuna's scruples about war, which leads on to an exposition of the doctrine of Salvation through Devotion to Krishna.

The problems of its date and composition are almost as complex as in the case of our Bible. Some scholars (*e.g.* Dasgupta and W. D. P. Hill) consider it to be a literary unity; others (*e.g.* Garbe and Otto) believe that they can find within it an 'original *Gita*' corresponding to the 'Ur-Marcus' or 'Proto-Luke' of our New Testament Critics. Moreover, as in the case of the Bible, there is more than one Text of the *Gita*; and the 'Kashmir Text' has been the subject of at least one substantial monograph.

The message of the *Gita,* too, is interpreted almost as variously as the message of the Bible. Sankara found in it authority for his thorough-going Monism, in which the only Reality is the Absolute Brahman. Ramanuja based upon it his Theism; and the majority of modern commentators (including Radhakrishnan) follow him in finding in the *Gita* a predominant note of devotion to Krishna as a personal God. But the Krishna of the *Gita* is not necessarily a historic figure. Radhakrishnan, while maintaining that there is good evidence that a historic Krishna did exist, holds that, for the teaching of the *Gita*, this is 'immaterial,' (p.29). In this, his attitude reminds us of that of the Catholic Modernists, such as Fr. Tyrrell, and some of our 'Form-Critics,' towards the historic Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels; or of Emil Brunner, who maintains that:

> 'The Christian Faith is not interested in "the Founder of Christianity," nor in His influence on History.' (*The Mediator,* Engl. transl., p. 81.)

So, to the Hindu Modernist, Krishna, whether historical or not, is to be worshipped primarily as the expression of an *idea* that is eternally true ('the everlasting bringing-forth of the divine life in the universe and in the soul of man.' p. 28. It is this *idea* that is the Object of Faith.

The plan of Radhakrishnan's Commentary is as follows: He sets forth each verse first in romanized Sanskrit, followed by an English translation, and this in turn by a comment; and then on to the next verse. This method has advantages; but it produces a 'broken' effect, which makes it difficult to follow the general line of thought. Many readers will prefer the method adopted by W. D. P. Hill, in his Commentary (O.U. Press, 1928), where we have a page of the Sanskrit (in Devanagiri script) side by side with an English rendering.

Many of the issues raised by the *Gita* are of vital importance to-day. First among these is that of Pacifism. Arjuna the warrior is overwhelmed on the battlefield with conscientious scruples, and appeals to Krishna for guidance:

> 'Alas! what a great sin have we resolved to commit in striving to slay our own people through our greed for the pleasures of the kingdom! Far better would it be for me that they should slay me in battle, while I remain unresisting and unarmed!' (I. 45, 46, Radhakrishnan's translation.)

But Krishna bids him: 'Yield not to this unmanliness; cast off this petty faintheartedness!' (113); and supports this counsel by three arguments:

(1) the killing of the body is not really a grave sin; for the soul cannot thereby be destroyed:

> 'He that knows that it [the Soul, or Self] is indestructible and eternal,—how can such a person "slay" anyone, or cause anyone to "slay"?' (II. 21).

(2) To fight is the divinely-appointed Duty (*dharma*) of one who belongs to the Warrior (*Ksatriya*) caste:

> 'There exists no greater good for a Ksatriya than a war enjoined by Duty. If thou doest not this lawful battle, then thou wilt fail in thy duty, and wilt incur sin.' (II. 31, 33.)

(3) The pacifist will be scorned by his fellows as a coward:

> 'The great warriors will think that thou hast abstained from battle through fear, and will make light of thee, slandering thy strength. Could anything be sadder than this?' (II. 34, 36).

This last argument hardly accords with the highest idealism; but a fine note is struck in the command to fight without passion, and even without craving for victory, but simply in obedience to Duty:

> 'treating alike pleasure and pain, victory and defeat.' (II. 38).

The latter part of the *Gita* deals with the three Ways of Salvation, through Work, Knowledge, and Devotion. Of these, the third is declared to be the highest; and in this, the *Gita* approaches the doctrine of Justification by Faith rather than by Works.

> 'Surrendering in thought all actions to Me, regarding Me as the Supreme, thou shalt, by My Grace, cross over all difficulties . . . Come to Me for shelter; I shall release thee from all evils.' (XVIII. 57, 58, 66).

To Christians, such exhortations will sound unexpectedly familiar. But there are other passages in the *Gita* which the Christian conscience will

challenge sharply. Nowhere in the New Testament, and hardly even in the Old, is God pictured in such terms as these:

> 'I am Death, the all-devouring; . . . of the deceitful, I am the gambling.'—or, 'the Dice-Play.' (Hill).

All students of Hinduism will value Prof. Radhakrishnan's exposition of the *Gita*. It may be that at times his exegesis seems designed more to edify modern readers than to draw out the original meaning of the text. But in this, there are not a few commentators on the Bible who resemble him. Often, too, his language echoes that of the Christian, rather than the old Hindu, tradition; as in the closing words of his Introductory Essay, in which he looks forward to the time 'when the kingdom of God is established, and when it is on earth as it is in heaven.' (p. 78). Such words are more reminiscent of Christ than of Sankara, and would sound strange to the majority of Hindus to-day.

It may be of interest, in closing, to recall some words written in 1785 by a Governor-General of India, Warren Hastings, as an introduction to Sir Charles Wilkins' *'The Bhagvat-Geeta, or the Dialogues of Kreeshna and Arjoon'*:

> 'Many passages will seem obscure, many will seem redundant; others will be found cloathed with ornaments of fancy unsuited to our taste . . . But every accumulation of knowledge is the gain of humanity; it imprints on the hearts of our own countrymen the obligation of benevolence. Even in England, this effect of it is greatly wanting. It is not long since the inhabitants of India were considered as creatures scarce elevated above the degree of savage life; nor, I fear, is that prejudice wholly eradicated. Every instance which brings their real character home to observation will impress us with a more generous sense of feeling for their natural rights. But such instances can only be obtained in their writings; and these will survive when the British dominion in India shall have long ceased to exist, and when the sources which it once yielded of wealth and power are lost to remembrance.' (pp. 7, 13).

Surely prophetic words by a great British statesman, who, in the far-off days of 'John Company,' foresaw that the true fulfilment of British Rule in India would be the coming of Indian Independence; which indeed came to pass in the year of Our Lord Nineteen Hunderd and Forty Seven, under George the Fifth, King of England, and the last of the British Emperors of India.

E. C. Dewick

OUR GREATEST NORMAN CHURCH*

There is no cluster of mediaeval buildings in England with the possible exception of Windsor which surpasses in interest those of Durham—half Church of God, half castle 'gainst the Scots.

A new series of volumes on English Cathedrals begins with Durham. It contains more than 70 skilfully selected photographic illustrations and the text of some 15,000 words which accompanies the illustrations; possesses a precise and scientific quality which gives an educational value to the volume usually lacking in the popular guide books. We could have wished, however, that it had been possible to have included in the volume the whole group of mediaeval Durham buildings, but the scope of this new cathedral series forbade it. The

* *Our Greatest Norman Church*, by G. H. Cook. (Phoenix House Ltd., 1948; 12/6.)
Cathedral Book No. 2, 'Durham.' (Lund, Humphries & Co., 12 Bedford Square, London, 1948; 3/6.)

text is contributed by Mr. G. H. Cook, whose *Mediaeval Chantries and Chantry Chapels* at once received recognition as a standard work on that theme. For the student of English architecture Durham Cathedral is of supreme interest as it exhibits to its student the method and stages by which the Romanesque style passed into Gothic. At first sight it seems curious that the Norman builders of Durham Cathedral should have erected it to enshrine the sanctity and material remains of two great Anglo-Saxon saints, St. Cuthbert and the Venerable Bede, but such was the reverence and loyalty of the Anglian population for the great saints who had given them the Christian Religion that any attempt to substitute others for them must have ended in failure. Mr. Cook writes:

> 'Architecturally, Durham Cathedral has no equal amongst Anglo-Romanesque buildings — not only is it the least altered of all the Norman churches in England, being substantially as it was in the twelfth century, but in its building was achieved the triumphant solution of a structural problem that had taxed the ingenuity of masons in Western Europe for centuries, *viz.* the erection of a stone roof or vault as a covering for a whole church — choir, nave, transepts and aisles.' (p. 19.)

It is an amazing fact that the greater part of this vast and immensely solid edifice was constructed within the brief period of forty years. The Purbeck marble used in some of the later portions of the building was transported by sea from the Wessex coast. Of no other building in Great Britain can it be more truly said of its Norman architects,

> 'They built in marble, built as they,
> Who thought those walls should see the day
> When Christ should come.
> And that those halls,
> Should stand o'er them
> Till Judgment calls.'

'Durham,' in *Cathedral Books* (No. 2), is a paper covered Guide Book to Durham Cathedral. It is beautifully illustrated and has a very interesting Introduction by Mr. W. A. Pantin, Fellow of Oriel. It is most educational in its account of the mediaeval furniture of the Cathedral. Its carved wooden stalls and unrivalled font-cover, Durham owes to Bishop Cosin, who played a very important part in the Revision of our Prayer Book of 1662. Mr. Pantin writes of the stalls and font-cover:

> 'They are a splendid example of traditional Gothic craftsmanship surviving into the seventeenth century.' (p. 11.)

F.S.A.

DR. LATOURETTE ON THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION OF YESTERDAY AND TO-MORROW

All modern students of the Christian Religion owe much to Professor K. S. Latourette of Yale University. His eight solid volumes narrating the *History of the Expansion of Christianity* constitute a standard work which must find a place in every representative library of Church history.

Professor Latourette is not only erudite and conscientious but he is essentially sympathetic and liberal in his treatment of his theme. The missionary endeavours of all who profess and call themselves Christian receive generous treatment at his hands. Essentially orthodox and Evangelical in his own faith, he does not deny the Christian title to those who are otherwise

minded. His *magnum opus* has recently been followed by two small volumes which summarize the main conclusions derived from his missionary study.

These two volumes are *The Unquenchable Light* and *To-morrow is Here*.* *The Unquenchable Light* contains the Belden Noble Lectures delivered at Harvard University. These nine lectures deal with the successive advances and recessions of the Christian Religion. They are divided thus:

1. The initial advance to A.D. 500
2. 950—1350
3. 1500—1750
4. 1815—1915
5. The latest age A.D. 1914 to the present.

Christian expansion has been curiously uneven. Dr. Latourette summarizes it as follows:

> 'In some regions and among some peoples it long failed to gain entrance and then, when it obtained admittance, did not flourish. In others where it gave promise of an important future it disappeared. In still others where it was once potent it dwindled.'

The ebb and flow of the advancing tide is determined by many factors. Dr. Latourette summarizes them thus:

> 'It is clear that the influence of Jesus does not progress simply through the spontaneous response of the innate goodness of men. Man is not by nature either fully good or completely rational. There is that in some men which at once welcomes Jesus and His message. There is that in others which is roused to furious opposition. Still more never understand him. It was thus in the days of His flesh. Some few held to Him. Others crucified Him. Still more were swayed by the opinions of the tough-minded and strong-willed about them and never really comprehended either the loyalty or the opposition. So it has been through the centuries. The responses to Jesus have varied. They have been determined not simply by the quality of Jesus or by the representations of Him made by His professed followers, although these have entered into the issue, but also by other factors, some of them quite remote from Jesus and His teachings.' (p. xi.)

Perhaps the particular theme in these lectures which will interest most readers is the discussion: What of the future? The lecturer recognizes that the Christian Religion is to-day in a period of rapid transition. He writes:

> 'The movements and forces in connection with which the influence of Jesus spread, and many of which were to a large extent the fruits of that influence, are weakening, disappearing, or being modified almost past recognition.'

Is, then, the Christian Religion faced with another great period of recession? Dr. Latourette hesitates to prophesy. He holds that a sound critical knowledge of past advances and recessions can do much to help us to answer that question. But that knowledge cannot give an assured and adequate answer since history does not repeat itself in its entirety. New factors enter in and old factors disappear. Hence unexpected combinations ensue and novel results follow. Nevertheless, Dr. Latourette is an optimist. He sees in the Christian Religion 'the clue and the hope of the human drama.' He inspires even when he does not convince.

* *The Unquenchable Light*. (Published by Eyre & Spottiswoode. First edition, 1945; second edition, 1948; 7/6.)

To-morrow is Here, by K. S. Latourette and W. R. Hogg. (Edinburgh House Press, 1948; 3/6.)

Dr. Latourette's latest volume, *To-morrow is Here,* throws further light on the prospects and future policies of the Christian Religion. This book is based on experiences derived from a religious convention held in 1947 at Whitby in Canada. It was an assembly of Anglicans, Baptists, Lutherans, Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Methodists and others; some of them converts from materialism, indifferentism, Islam, Brahminism and Roman Catholicism.

We find nothing novel in the motives or the methods of these recorded conversions. They throw little light on the future advance of Christianity. Dr. Latourette and his colleague, W. R. Hogg, hold that the Christian Religion will become the religion of mankind, but that it will be of two types — Papal and Free Christian. This seems to us to be a short-term view lacking in the critical insight and prophetic foresight of Dr. Hocking's *Living Religions and a World Faith.* (Hibbert Lectures for 1939.)

Looking at the present religious situation in relation to the future, Dr. Hocking writes: 'The Mission tries to make a particular religion universal. The new interest is to escape particularity and localism [in religion].' (p. 21.)

It seems clear to us that the World Religion of the future must concentrate on and develop this essential, universal and spiritual quality in religion and thereby eliminate the sectarian, temporal and materialistic elements which thwart religious unity, development and moral and spiritual leadership. The metaphysician, the scientist, the historian, the psychologist can be and are religion's truest friends and her indispensable helpers in this advance to universalism. The eternal elements in the religious consciousness of Jesus Christ and His Gospel of the Kingdom of God will have their place in that future World Religion, although much else which has borne the Christian name will have disappeared; but this will not happen to-morrow.

H.D.A.M.

DR. BEARE ON *I PETER**

Dean Selwyn's admirable Commentary on *The First Epistle of Peter,* to which a warm welcome was recently given by students of the New Testament, has now been succeeded by a no less admirable Commentary by Dr. Beare.

Dean Selwyn, after a comprehensive survey of the evidence, decided in favour of the traditional view of the origin of the Epistle, namely that it is a single document and that its author, St. Peter, an Aramaic-speaking Jew, made use of St. Paul's fellow-missionary, Silas or Silvanus, a Roman citizen and an accomplished Greek writer, to act as his interpreter and secretary in the composition of the Epistle, which St. Peter desired after the death of St. Paul to send to St. Paul's converts in Asia Minor to encourage them to face impending persecution with unflinching loyalty.

According to this view, *I Peter* was written from Rome, not later than 66 A.D., and included the greetings of that Church together with St. Peter's own greetings and those of St. Mark, who was with him in Rome at that time. None of these conclusions are acceptable to Dr. Beare. *I Peter* is for Dr. Beare (as it was for B. H. Streeter) a composite document, the main part of which is a Baptismal Sermon beginning with the words: 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ' (*I Peter* i, 3), and concluding with the Doxology, 'Whose is the glory and the dominion for ever and ever. Amen.' (iv, 11.) Prefixed to this Baptismal Sermon is a pseudonymous epistolary introduction (vv. 1 and 2). At the conclusion of the sermon there is

* *The First Epistle of Peter,* edited by Francis Wright Beare, B.A. (Toronto), Ph.D. (Chicago). (Blackwell, 1947; 15/-.)

attached an epistle by an anonymous presbyter warning his readers of the 'fiery trial' with which they are faced (iv, 12) and exhorting them to long-suffering, patience and courage. The presbyter's epistle also concludes with a Doxology (v, 11). Following on the Doxology is a concluding note (vv. 12-14) presumably by the same hand as the pseudonymous introduction in chapter i, verses 1-2, in support of the Petrine and Roman origin of *I Peter*.

Dr. Beare judges that the Baptismal Sermon is earlier than the presbyter's epistle. The presbyter's epistle, he is convinced, must be later than the younger Pliny's letter to Trajan, 111 A.D., but earlier than Polycarp's quotation from *I Peter* in his Epistle to the Philippians, which Dr. Beare assigns to about 135 A.D.

Dr. Beare stresses the absence of any reference to *I Peter* in the Ignatian Epistles as proving the late date of *I Peter,* but surely the zeal of St. Ignatius on behalf of the monarchical episcopate would not have been helped by St. Peter calling himself a presbyter and addressing his fellow-presbyters in that capacity.

Dr. Beare maintains that his late dating of *I Peter* is supported by our knowledge of (*a*) Imperial persecutions of the Christians, (*b*) by the developed character of church life and organization, (*c*) by the Pauline style and vocabulary of the Baptismal Sermon in which, curiously enough, the characteristic Pauline doctrine of Freedom from the Law, Justification by Faith, Mystical Union with Christ are not included.

There is much to be said for and against Dr. Beare's arguments. Ramsey was quite certain that *I Peter* was written after the Neronian persecution and that therefore it could not have been written by St. Peter if, according to the generally accepted view, St. Peter was martyred in that persecution. If, however, St. Peter survived the Neronian persecution then Ramsey held that St. Peter might have written the Epistle. Ramsey was much influenced by Hort in his Petrine conclusion. Harnack's view was opposed to that of Hort and Ramsey. He held that *I Peter* circulated without either salutation or conclusion during the first half of the second century not as a letter but as an anonymous Christian treatise.

Dr. Beare's presentation of his case against the traditional origin of *I Peter* is formidable indeed, but we cannot deal further with it here. His Commentary on the Greek text is no less able. Like Dean Selwyn, he rejects the brilliant conjectural emendation of Rendle Harris which make *I Peter iii,* 19, refer to Enoch, not Christ, as preaching in the underworld to the antedeluvians whose sins had caused the Flood. V.M.B.

HELPS TO BIBLE READING

To judge by the reports of chaplains in the Forces the ignorance of the Bible among our male population is abysmal. Even pacifists who gave as their reason for their pacifism that war was contrary to the teaching of Christ were unable to give correctly the number of the Gospels in the New Testament. Parents no longer read the Bible nor encourage their children to read it. There are many explanations of this and some justifications. In England the increased emphasis on Biblical teaching in our national systems of education will certainly do much to revive a knowledge of the Bible.

Professor Goodspeed's volume, *How to read the Bible,** should be of particular help to those who have to teach the Bible in schools and study circles. One of the difficulties which faces the inexperienced Bible reader is the mass of material contained in the Bible and the mixture in the contents

* *How to read the Bible*, by Edgar J. Goodspeed (O.U.P., 1948; 7/6.)

of the various books. Dr. Goodspeed summarizes the aim and method of his little volume as follows:

> 'Let us then undertake a literary and historical approach to it, taking up the chief books in it as biography, oratory, history, poetry, drama and fiction, in the light of the times that produced them, and the purposes of their writers, thus combining literary and historical interests, always remembering that important as they undoubtedly are for literature and history, their religious messages must be kept uppermost, since it was chiefly to promote that side of life that they were written.' (p. vii.)

Obviously this is not a book for children but for educated adults who wish to learn and teach.

The concluding chapter, entitled 'English Bibles,' contains a very useful and succinct account of our English and American versions. In the light of its influence in creating our purest and noblest English prose the Authorized Version of 1611 stands unrivalled, and no English Revised Version which does not retain the A.V.'s vocabulary and rhythms, while at the same time correcting its most serious mistranslations with the greatest possible economy of disturbance to the text, will have attained the ideal of those who love our English tongue in its most perfect form, and desire to preserve it both for purposes of popular culture and religious devotion.

Dr G. F. Moore's *The Literature of the Old Testament**, in the Home University Library, we are glad to see has been re-issued in an edition which has been brought up to date by L. H. Brockington. This is a well-arranged collection of literary and historical facts about the composition of the books of the Old Testament. It is not primarily concerned with the valuation of the Bible as a vehicle of Divine Revelation, nor, on the other hand, is it concerned with the arresting contributions which archaeology has made in elucidating the historical background of Biblical literature. Its concern is the contribution made by literary criticism to the modern understanding of the Old Testament.

> 'The scope of this volume is the books of the Old Testament considered chiefly from the point of view of fundamental literary questions—the date and purpose of their composition, the reasons why certain books are considered to be compilations of various dates or are assigned by scholars to others than their reputed authors; the characteristics of the different types of Hebrew literature; history, prophecy, poetry, etc.; all essential for a proper understanding of the contents of the books.'

The volume makes no attempt at 'uplift.' It is clear, cool, concise, consistent, as becomes the first stage, not the last stage, in Bible study. Of course, like other volumes in the Home University Library, it is intended for adults.

V.M.B.

* *The Literature of the Old Testament*, by G. F. Moore, M.A., D.D., LL.D., and L. H. Brockington, M.A., B.D. (O.U.P. New edition H.U.L., 1913—1948; 5/-.)

A BISHOP'S JOB*

This book, so modest, so kindly, may be sure of a welcome. Its very title is interpretative, for if ever a volume of personal recollections has given us some insight into the activities of a modern ecclesiastic, this does. In its pages we find the record of a full and active life, well spent in the service of God and man. It covers a wide field, from early days at Clifton College

**A Man's Job*: Reminiscences by James Theodore Inskip, D.D., sometime Bishop of Barking. (London: Skeffington, 1948; 12/6.)

to the formative years at Cambridge; then on to the work carried on in Cornwall, London, Jesmond and elsewhere, till Dr. Inskip finds himself Bishop of Barking, his retirement from which post took place at Michaelmas this year. An Evangelical by training and conviction, he has remained one, though he has never been a party man. It may be worth quoting one or two sentences from the last chapter of the volume; they reveal the man:

> 'The longer I live, the more tolerant I become; but at the same time the more convinced a Protestant. I have studied for sixty years the literature of those who deny a Protestant character to our Church; I have attended their services and listened to their preachers and speakers; I have learned from them, I have admired many of their votaries, I have found friends among them and have come to love them; and in my ministry as Bishop I have tried to help them in every possible way, yet my attachment to the foundation principles of churchmanship in which my father trained me have remained unchanged and unshaken.'

So writes the son of that stalwart, James Inskip, and the brother of the late Chief Justice of England, Lord Caldecote. Those quoted words form a worthy ending to the record of a long and strenuous life. E.H.B.

CORRESPONDENCE

SIR,

Some northern members of the Modern Churchmen's Union have formed themselves, with the approval and financial support of the Council, into a Committee to promote a residential conference, which will be held from the evening of Tuesday, April 5th, 1949, to the morning of Friday, April 8th, in University College (The Castle), Durham City, by kind permission of the Master.

The Committee's intention is not, of course, to compete with the Annual Conference, but rather to cater for those members of the Union who find it difficult to travel South; and also to offer to thinking people in the North a simple and clear statement of a Modern Churchman's faith. Hence the subject of the Conference will be 'Christian Essentials,' with a sub-title, 'A Faith for Men and Women of To-day.'

We hope that your readers will support this new venture and will make it as widely known as possible. The Conference programme will be published shortly; the Secretary of the Committee, the Rev. C. R. Stagg, 32 South Street, Durham City, will be glad to receive names of those likely to be interested.

H. K. LUCE (*Chairman*)
M. T. DUNLOP
H. C. SNAPE
E. J. PAYNE
C. R. STAGG (*Secretary*).

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1949

The thirty-second Annual Conference of Modern Churchmen will be held at Will's Hall, University of Bristol, September 6th to September 9th, 1949. Inclusive Conference ticket £4. For further particulars apply to the Hon. Secretary of the Conference:

MISS IRENE WALKER, F.R.Hist.Soc.,
Churchill Court,
Bristol.